

DAMAGE BOOK

290.4 J92 v.2
 Judaism gift
 Judaism and Christ-
 ianity SEP '38
 Acc. No. 955219
 31.04 210c '78
 285/5 35.9
 ON APR 10 AM

290.4 J92 v.2

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket



0 0001 0310504 5

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY
II
THE CONTACT OF PHARISAISM
WITH OTHER CULTURES

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY
II
THE CONTACT OF PHARISAISM
WITH OTHER CULTURES

Judaism and Christianity. Vol. I

The Age of Transition

THE GENERAL HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., Litt.D.
Emeritus Professor of King's College,
London

RELIGION IN THE GRÆCO-ROMAN WORLD

By E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A.,
Professor of the History and Philosophy of
Religion in the University of Leeds

THE WISDOM LITERATURE: A SAGE AMONG HIS
PEOPLE

By W. O. E. Oesterley

THE APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE: A SEER AMONG
HIS PEOPLE

By W. O. E. Oesterley

PHARISAISM

By Herbert Loewe, M.A., Hon. Fellow of
Queens' College, Cambridge; Reader in
Rabbinics

THE BELIEF IN ANGELS AND DEMONS

By W. O. E. Oesterley

THE WAY OF THE INITIATE

By S. H. Hooke, B.D., Samuel Davidson
Professor of Old Testament Studies in the
University of London

CHRISTIANITY AND THE MYSTERY RELIGIONS

By S. H. Hooke

THE EMERGENCE OF CHRISTIANITY FROM JUDAISM

By S. H. Hooke

Ios. 6d. net



"LAW AND LOVE", BY DOUGLAS STRACHAN, LL.D.
For description, see pp. xxi-xxii

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

VOLUME II
THE CONTACT OF PHARISAISM
WITH OTHER CULTURES

Essays by

H. LOEWE, W. L. KNOX, J. PARKES,
E. ROSENTHAL, L. RABINOWITZ,
G. G. COULTON, A. G. ADCOCK,
H. F. STEWART

Edited by

H. LOEWE

LONDON
THE SHELDON PRESS
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.2
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

First published 1937

**DEDICATED
TO THE MEMORY OF
FRANCIS CRAWFORD BURKITT
“A man in whom is the spirit of God”**

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
H. LOEWE, M.A., HON. FELLOW OF QUEENS' COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; READER IN RABBINICS	
ABBREVIATIONS	xv
TRANSLATIONS	xix
DESCRIPTION OF FRONTISPICE	xxi
CHAP.	
I. THE IDEAS OF PHARISAISM	3
H. LOEWE	
II. PHARISAISM AND HELLENISM	61
REV. CANON W. L. KNOX, M.A., TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD; PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, WARDEN OF THE ORATORY HOUSE, CAMBRIDGE	
III. ROME, PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN	115
REV. JAMES PARKES, M.A., HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD; ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE	
IV. ISLAM	147
DR E. ROSENTHAL, LATE GOLDSMID LECTURER, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON; LECTURER IN SEMITICS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER	
V. FRANCE IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY	189
RABBI L. RABINOWITZ, M.A.	

CHAP.		PAGE
VI.	THE FEUDAL PERIOD	223
	G. G. COULTON, LITT.D., F.B.A., FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE AND A. C. ADCOCK, B.A., LATE SCHOLAR OF KING'S COLLEGE	
VII.	RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION	255
	A. C. ADCOCK	
VIII.	CASUISTRY—JEWISH AND JESUIT DIA- LECTICS	299
	REV. DR H. F. STEWART, FELLOW AND DEAN OF CHAPEL, TRINITY COLLEGE, CAM- BRIDGE	
INDEX:		
A.	GENERAL	333
B.	LIST OF PASSAGES CITED	366

PREFACE

The term Pharisaism is used in the title—and also often throughout this book—in a special, not to say in an unusual, sense. It does not denote Pharisaism as opposed to Sadduceanism nor is it a synonym of Judaism in contradistinction to Christianity. The age of the Pharisees—the duration of which is discussed on p. 7 below, ended with the parting of the ways: it was, therefore, the last period to which one can look back for tracing community of interest and outlook in Christianity and Judaism. At this formative period there is no question of borrowing, since the separation was yet to come. For this reason, Pharisaism is here employed as a convenience, to represent ideas which, coming down from earlier times or originating in the Pharisaic period, passed into the common heritage of Judaism and Christianity and which, through the medium of these religions, ultimately came into contact with external forms of thought and modes of life. The essays in this book endeavour to estimate the result of this contact. Elements which are distinctively Jewish and which Christianity rejected—such as the dietary laws—and, conversely, purely Christian ideas, such as the Incarnation, which Judaism repudiated, are outside the scope of this book.

The incidents which gave rise to the planning of these lectures are mentioned on pp. 52–3 below. But for several reasons the original project has been slightly modified. It was at first thought desirable, in the interests of uniformity, that certain selected subjects

for discussion should be common to each contributor and should be treated in every lecture. This would, however, have produced a superficial unity: not every subject thus selected would have merited consideration at different epochs. The freedom of each lecturer would have been seriously restricted. It was considered preferable, in the desire for spontaneity, to avoid collaboration and to leave each lecturer full liberty to interpret his theme precisely according to his reading of his brief.* In this way it is hoped that a more real and a less mechanical uniformity has been obtained. In any case, the purpose first contemplated could have been achieved only if each essay had been entrusted to two writers, working in conjunction, since few specialists are inclined to stray beyond the sphere of their own immediate studies. It needs some courage for a Rabbinical scholar to write about Patristics, or for a Church historian to deal with Midrash. But such a dual plan was clearly impracticable. As a consequence, we have what we venture to hope will be an impetus to further work. Many problems are merely adumbrated: they are not developed, since the book is intended for the general reader no less than for the theologian, whose knowledge is specialized and is not necessarily co-extensive with every period and with every branch of theological studies. Besides, to enter into such problems would

* The proofs of the lectures in vol. II have been circulated among the contributors and, in general, their mutual agreement may be assumed. But this statement must not be taken too strictly since, for various reasons, collaborators may have directed their attention mainly, if not exclusively, to their own chapters. The independence, therefore, of each lecturer, his entire responsibility for his own opinions and his freedom from responsibility for those of his colleagues, have thus been assured.

have destroyed the balance of the book and would have exhausted its allotted compass before the earliest chapters were ended. A typical example is the question of the "Pattern" in Plato and in Philo, which Canon Knox discusses on pp. 75 sqq. below. Seeing that the idea of the "Pattern" is found on the Rabbinic side and seeing that an unusual Greek term for it is employed in Hebrew, the problem immediately arises, whether the concept of the "Pattern" was borrowed by Jews from the Greek, even though traces of it can be found in the Bible. But since the adequate treatment of such a problem would require much more than the space which is available, it has been left, with a footnote, to future investigators. The work of the editor has been restricted in the greatest degree: his main object has been to link up, by indicative footnotes, similar ideas occurring in different essays, such as pre-existence, which Judaism knows, for example, in regard to the Torah and the name of the Messiah, which is so important in Christianity and which provoked in Islam the controversy whether the *Kur'an* was created or eternal. But such notes have been limited as far as possible, since the index provides all the help that the reader is likely to require.

It is not to be expected that all the views presented in this volume will commend themselves to every reader. It is, however, worthy of remark that the separate essays have not needed reconciliation. In this regard the editor's task has been a sinecure. That writers may differ fundamentally in their religious beliefs but yet succeed in approaching their task objectively, with sympathy for each other's views and with fidelity to their own, is not surprising, since they are brought

together by their sincerity and by the sacred nature of their quest. "The emulation of scholars increases knowledge." The spirit underlying these pages is precious, but it is neither novel nor exceptional. If one is inclined to despair of the present, one can take refuge in the past and thence draw confidence for the future. When we see the admirable collaboration of Christians and Jews, in such useful ventures as Kittel's Rabbinic texts, shattered by the evil genius of Nazidom, we must take comfort from History. The late Lord Salisbury bade us always use large maps and take long views. There have, before now, been times when bigotry and hatred have raged, as fiercely as to-day, but truth, crushed to earth, always springs up. The flames die down and the embers cool. Amid just such an age of religious embitterment and persecution, we recall a well-known instance of love and friendship drawing together Catholic, Jew and Reformer, in their zeal to reinterpret the Bible in the light of the New Learning and to impart, each to the other, the best of his intellectual and spiritual store. One of these men, Paul Fagius, whose bones were burned on our Cambridge Market Hill, was a German Protestant. The second of the trio was Cardinal Aegidio of Viterbo, and the third was Elias Levita, a Jew from Germany.* Let him tell the story in his own words, taken from the preface to his book *The Tishbite*, the Isny edition of which (with the Latin translation) will be found, almost certainly, in every College Library:

While I was yet in Venice, busied with this book, I was distressed and anxious to find a place where it could be

* For Levita see below, p. 284.

printed, for the great printer Daniel Bomberg had closed his press and worked no more.... Then a Christian from Germany wrote to me telling me the good news that he had set up a printing press and inviting my collaboration and offering to print any books I had ready.... Now I had heard many excellent reports about this man and about his knowledge of Hebrew. So his words moved me to pleasure and acceptance and I knew that this was the Lord's doing. For often have I been invited by nobles and Cardinals, even by the King of France [Francis I] to be Professor of Hebrew at Paris, but I would never listen to their requests. But when I came to this man, I found him full of wisdom, of which not one-half had been told me. Many draw water from the wells of his doctrine. He seeks the welfare of his people. He is a fine preacher and a fine exegete. It is with truth that his co-religionists apply to him our saying about Moses, "From Moses unto Moses [Moses Maimonides] there arose not one like Moses," so they say. "From Paul unto Paul [Fagius] there arose not one like Paul."

Now when he saw this book of mine, he translated it into Latin, setting the two languages, Hebrew and Latin, column next to column: he added naught, he struck out naught. Thus we decided to print it together and we put our mind to the work with all our united strength, he on his side, I on mine. We prayed each one of us to his God to prosper our work. And may the pleasantness of the Lord our God be upon us: prosper Thou the work of our hands upon us, O prosper thou our handiwork.

It was in 1541 that *The Tishbite* appeared: after a lapse of nearly four centuries, students of the Bible still find it a source of help. It is the sincere hope of all of us who have taken part in this undertaking that this our handiwork, too, will be prospered and that our efforts may, for some little time at least, be of utility

and blessing to those to whom Christianity and Judaism are as sacred and as vital as they were to Paulus Fagius, to Elias Levita, and above all to him who has recently passed from us, and to whose memory these pages are lovingly dedicated.

The Editor and his Colleagues, no less than the readers of this volume, are indebted to Mr John G. T. Sheringham, B.A., of Westcott House, Cambridge, Moderator in Oriental Languages of Trinity College, Dublin, for the preparation of the index and list of citations.

ABBREVIATIONS

- A.L.* *Agricultural Life of the Jews in Babylonia*, by J. Newman.
Oxford 1932.
- A.L.W.* See Translations.
- A.R.N.* *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ed. S. Schechter. Vienna 1887
- A.W.S.* See Translations.
- C.* See Translations.
- C.A.J.* *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, by S. Grayzel. Philadelphia 1933.
- Cant.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- C.C.S.* *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, by J. Parkes. London 1934.
- C.H.B.* *The Censorship of Hebrew Books*, by W. Popper. New York 1899.
- C.J.* *Codex Justinianus*.
- C.T.* *Codex Theodosianus*.
- D.* See Translations.
- Deut.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- E.* See Translations.
- Eccles.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- Enc.Jud.* *Encyclopaedia Judaica, Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Berlin 1927-.
- Est.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- Exod.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- G.* See Translations.
- Gen.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- H.D.* See Translations.
- H.E.W.* *Hebrew Ethical Wills*, selected and edited by I. Abrahams (with translations), 2 vols. Philadelphia 1926.
- H.J.E.* *A History of the Jews in England*, by A. M. Hyamson, 2nd ed. London 1928.
- H.L.* *Lectures on the origin and growth of religion... of the ancient Hebrews*, by C. G. Montefiore (Hibbert Lectures, 1892). London 1892.
- H.U.C.A.* *Hebrew Union College Annual*. Ohio 1924-.
- J.A.E.* *The Jews of Angevin England*, by J. Jacobs. London 1893.

- J.C.A.* *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, by F. C. Burkitt
 (Schweich Lectures, 1913). London 1914.
- J.C.R.* *Jüdisches im Christentum des Reformationszeitalters*, by
 M. Güdemann. Vienna 1870.
- J.E.* *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, 12 vols. New York and
 London 1901–7.
- J.I.C.* *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*, by L. I.
 Newman. New York 1925.
- J.L.* *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, by I. Abrahams. London
 1896. (The pagination is followed in Dr Roth's ed.
 London 1932.)
- J.Q.R.* (O.S.) and *J.Q.R.* (N.S.) *The Jewish Quarterly Review*
 (Old Series), edited by I. Abrahams and C. G.
 Montefiore, vols. 1–xx. London 1888–1908; there-
 after continued in America under different editor-
 ship (New Series).
- Jud.* *Judaism*, by G. F. Moore, vols. 1–iii. Cambridge
 (Harvard) 1927–30.
- K.* *Studies in Jewish Literature... in honour of... K. Kohler...*
 Berlin 1913.
- Kab.* *The Kabbala*, by C. D. Ginsburg. London 1865.
- L.* See Translations.
- Lam.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- Leg.Vis.* *Leges Visigothorum.*
- Lev.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- Löw.* *Graphische Requisiten und Erzeugnisse bei den Juden*, by
 Leopold Löw, in his *Beiträge zur Jüd. Alterthumskunde*,
 2 vols. Leipzig 1870–1.
- M.* See Translations.
- Ma.* *Philonis... opera...*, ed. Thomas Mangey. London
 1742.
- Mekh.¹* *Mekhilta*, ed. I. H. Weiss. Vienna 1865.
- Mekh.²* See Translations, *L.*
- Mekh.³* *Mekhilta*, ed. H. S. Horovitz. Breslau 1931.
- M.G.W.J.* *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*.
 Breslau 1851–.
- Midr.R.* *Midrash Rabbah*, ed. Wilna 1878. (On the Pent. and
 5 scrolls.)
- M.T.* *Midrash Tehillim (Shoher Tobh)*, ed. S. Buber. Wilna
 1891.
- Num.R.* See *Midr.R.*
- P.B.A.* *A Companion to the Authorized Daily Prayer Book...*
 [Ashkenazic rite], by I. Abrahams. London 1922
 (usually bound with *P.B.S.*).

- P.B.D.A.* *Service of the Synagogue* [i.e. Festival prayers, Ashkenazic rite], by A. Davis and H. M. Adler, vols. I-VI. London 1908. (Pagination is the same in all edd.)
- P.B.G.* *The Book of Prayer and order of service...of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews*, VI vols., by M. Gaster. Oxford and London 1901-6.
- P.B.P.* *Book of Prayer...of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews*, by D. de Sola Pool. New York 1936.
- P.B.S.* *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book...[Ashkenazic rite]*, by S. Singer. London 1929. (The numerical pagination applies to all edd., but the earlier edd. lack the additional pages designated by consonants after numerals.)
- Pes.K.* *Pesikta de R. Kahana*, ed. S. Buber. Lyck 1868. [In the recent photostatic (?) reprint, Romm, Wilna 1925, the pagination of the text (but not necessarily of Buber's notes, which have been corrected and supplemented) agrees with the ed. of 1868.]
- Pes.R.* *Pesikta Rabbathi*, ed. M. Friedmann. Vienna 1880.
- P.G.* *Patrologia Graeco-Latina*.
- R.* See Translations.
- R.E.J.* *Revue des Études Juives*. Paris 1880-.
- R.T.* *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching*, by C. G. Montefiore. London 1930.
- Ruth R.* See *Midr.R.*
- S.* See Translations.
- S.C.B.M.* *Stamps and Charters in the British Museum*, vol. I by I. Abrahams, H. P. Stokes and H. Loewe. London 1930; vols. II, III by H. Loewe. London 1932.
- Sifra* *Sifra*, ed. I. H. Weiss. Vienna 1862.
- Sifre* *Sifre* (Num. and Deut.), ed. M. Friedmann. Vienna 1864.
- Sifre H.* *Sifre* (Num. only), ed. H. S. Horovitz. Leipzig 1917.
- Sin.* See Translations.
- S.J.W.* *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, by H. St John Thackeray (Schweich Lectures 1920). London 1920.
- S.R.P.* *Selected religious poems of Solomon ibn Gabirol...*, by I. Zangwill and I. Davidson. Philadelphia 1923.
- Tanh.* *Tanhuma*, ed. Stettin. 1865. [The pagination of the text (but not necessarily of the Commentaries 'es Yošef and 'anaf Yošef) agrees with that of the recent Horeb photostatic reproduction.]

ABBREVIATIONS

- Tanh.B.* *Tanhuma*, ed. S. Buber. Wilna 1885
T.d.B.E. *Tanna de Be Eliyyahu*, ed. M. Friedmann. Vienna 1904.
T.J. *Jerusalem Talmud*, cited from ed. Krotoschin, 1866.
Tos. *Tosefta*, cited from ed. M. Zuckerman. Pasewalk 1880.
W. See Translations.
Z. See *Tos.*

TRANSLATIONS

For the benefit of readers unacquainted with Hebrew, reference has been made to the following translations of Rabbinic works:

(a) *The Mishnah*

- D. Herbert Danby, English translation of *The Mishnah*. Oxford 1933.
- E. W. A. L. Elmslie, English translation of *The Mishna on Idolatry, 'Aboda Zara*. Cambridge 1911.†
- R. J. Rabbinowitz's English translation of *Mishnah Megillah*. Oxford 1931.†
- A.L.W. A. Lukyn Williams, English translation of *Tractate Berakoth, Mishna and Tosephta*. London 1921.
- H.D. Herbert Danby's English translation of *Tractate Sanhedrin, Mishnah and Tosefta*. London 1919.

Note. *The Ethics of the Fathers (Pirke 'Aboth)* is usually cited from P.B.S. English translations, and excellent notes, will also be found in the edd. of C. Taylor (Cambridge 1897, 2nd ed.)†; R. Travers Herford (New York 1930, 2nd ed.)†; W. O. E. Oesterley (S.P.C.K. 1919).

(b) *The Tosefta*

- A.L.W. See above.
- H.D. See above.

(c) *The Babylonian Talmud*

- G. L. Goldschmidt's German translation and text of *Der Babylonische Talmud, I-IX*. Berlin 1897-1936. N.B. There is a recent smaller edition containing only the translation, but references to it have not been given.
- A.W.S. A. W. Streane's English translation of *Chagigah*. Cambridge 1891.
- C. A. Cohen's English translation of *Berakhot*. Cambridge 1921.
- M. H. Malter's English translation of *Ta'anith*. Philadelphia 1928.†

† The text is included.

(d) *The Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud*

- S. (1) M. Schwab's French translation of *Le Talmud de Jérusalem*, xi vols. Paris 1871-89. A photostatic reproduction, in xii vols., with an introduction by M. Liber, was issued by Maisonneuve, Paris, in 1932.
 (2) His English version, only of *Berakhoth*. London 1886.

(e) *Certain Midrashim*

- W. A. Wünsche's German translation of the Rabboth, Pešikta Kahana and Midrash Psalms in his *Bibliotheca Rabbinica*, 3 vols. Leipzig 1880-3. N.B. Those who use this book should refer to the notes and corrections at the end of each Midrash.
- L. J. Z. Lauterbach's English translation of *Mekilta...*, 3 vols. Philadelphia 1933-5.†
- Sin. F. Singermann's German translation of *Tanhuma*.† N.B. This is of Genesis only. It is not Buber's text. It is obtainable from the author at 88 Neue Königstrasse, Berlin, N.W. 43.

† The text is included.

DESCRIPTION OF FRONTISPICE

The two pictures, which serve as the frontispieces to volumes I and II, demonstrate the difference between modern and mediaeval treatment of the theme to which these volumes are devoted, i.e. the mutual relations of Judaism and Christianity and their attitude to the surrounding world. The statues at Rochester Cathedral, representing "The Church and the Synagogue", were reproduced in a B.B.C. pamphlet, *Our Debt to the Past*, by Dr Edwyn Bevan, in 1928. The better known group, similarly named, at Strassburg, can be seen in the *Legacy of Israel* (p. xxxvi), which contains yet another instance, taken from the Jesse tree in a twelfth-century Bible written in England, perhaps at Canterbury. Dr Singer thus describes the symbolism of the artist: "The Church looks sternly at her sister. She wears a crown which she has taken from the head of the Synagogue.... In her left hand she holds the chalice, which has come to her also from the Synagogue. With her right hand she plants the banner of the cross firmly to the ground. To the right stands the Synagogue. Her head is downcast and her eyes are veiled... her staff is broken... her left hand still grasps a fragment of the commandments."

This subject is fully discussed by Abrahams, in his essay on "The Decalogue in Art", in *K.*, pp. 39 sqq.

We have to wait for the present age before we find a more sympathetic treatment of the Synagogue and a more true presentation of the similarity of interest of the two faiths and their interdependence. In vol. I, the late S. J. Solomon's "An Allegory", represented Moses and Jesus. Here, Dr Strachan portrays Judaism and Christianity as loving sisters, each helping the other. The group comes from a stained glass window in the Chapel of Westminster College, Cambridge, completed in 1921. "The two small lights in the gable above the gallery symbolize 'Law' and 'Love' in the dispensation of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament.... In the hands of the one figure is the roll of the Commandments; in those of the other, the chalice of sacrifice."

The following is an extract from a letter by the artist, in reply to an invitation to amplify the caption. Dr Strachan writes:

"When you invite me to add a line to the caption I find myself puzzled; with nothing to say. When I examine

myself saying, ‘But you must have been thinking of *something* when you designed that little window?’ ‘No?’ ‘Feeling then?’ ‘Oh yes’, and without being fanciful, it might be possible to trace any significance that little thing may have to the fact that as a child I thought of the O.T. and N.T. as one: Parts I and II of one story. Subsequent study brought various informations about origins and the inner meaning of spiritual antagonisms. But the original impression remained and remains. And, the Gospels apart, I feel ‘more at home’ in the O.T. than in the New. The ‘Law : Love’ antithesis may serve well enough to distinguish B.C. from A.D. in a crude sort of way, but Law, the ruthless, is quite as much in evidence as Love, in A.D. So I find it simpler to think of Life as ‘Law and Love’, the same—save for slight and temporary variations in the proportions—throughout time.”

This spirit of the artist is peculiarly appropriate also to the spirit of Westminster College—in particular to its Chapel. For this institution is based, in an exceptionally precious degree, on the synthesis of Law and Love: it inspires the teaching, the prayers, the practice, the life of all who teach, pray, learn and go forth from its walls. On either side are beautiful windows, illustrating the Bible scenes, Old and New alike. At the East end is a vast blue apse, typifying the divine presence creating the world, sustaining, inspiring it. And after divine worship is ended and congregants, their hearts filled with peace and love to all, turn to leave, they behold, over the West door, this beautiful universalist allegory, sealing the lesson of God’s Fatherhood and Man’s brotherhood, which it has been the purpose of the service to instil.

For the possibility of reproducing this window, thanks are due, in the first place, to the Principal and Senatus of Westminster College; to the artist, for much help in regard to technique; to Mrs Austin Kennett, who has so skilfully copied the window, which, owing to structural conditions and difficulties of tone, did not lend itself readily to photography; to Prof. A. B. Cook of Queens’ College, and to the Archaeological Fund, for their generous assistance in making this beautiful representation—as well as that in volume i—possible.

CHAPTER I
THE IDEAS OF PHARISAISM

BY
H. LOEWE

N O T E S

The attention of readers who may not be Hebraists is drawn to the circumstance that Rabbinic citations are, whenever possible, accompanied by references to translations in English, French or German. These translations, as set out on pp. xix-xx, are available in most theological libraries, and it is hoped that, by this means, students who are not acquainted with Hebrew may be introduced to Rabbinic literature. By looking up the references they will realize that this literature is not always so inaccessible and terrifying as it is sometimes deemed to be. But the temptation to dogmatize on the basis of translations must be avoided.

References to sources of statements are indicated by figures and will be found at the end of each chapter. The notes at the foot of the page are indicated by asterisks, etc. and supplement the information given in the text. No references are given for well-known proper names, such as 'Akiba, Nahum of Gimzo, etc., which are readily accessible in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* and elsewhere.

It is not fair to impose the responsibility of Rabbinic citations on scholars whose special subjects do not include Rabbinic Literature. The Editor therefore undertakes responsibility for such passages or notes as are enclosed in square brackets.

CHAPTER I

THE IDEAS OF PHARISAISM

The object of this series of lectures is to examine certain elements in Pharisaism which have passed into Judaism and Christianity, to trace their progress and to see what influence they have exerted or what influence has been exerted on them by other cultures. It does not aim at a comparison of Judaism and Christianity as religious systems, still less at a panegyric of either, but rather at investigating how these and other systems have dealt with the elements which Pharisaism offered them. There has been little or no collaboration between the several lecturers who are to participate in this course, and it is to be anticipated that their judgments, no less than their treatments of the subject may vary. Some may choose their illustrations from the lives of individuals, representative of their epoch; others, from literature or law; others, from morals or social life; diversity will enhance the interest of their lectures. But it can be confidently asserted that their attitude will be objective. It will be noted that some of us are Christians and some are Jews: this arrangement was in no wise deliberate. Religion did not enter into the question: we were concerned with individual studies and interests. Naturally, the student of one field of learning will be more at home in his own than in an adjacent field. It is difficult for anyone to be equally proficient in Rabbinics and Patristics simultaneously. Either Talmud or Migne is enough for one man. The specialist in Hebrew *Responsa* will be less

familiar than is the general mediaeval historian with the contemporary Christian literature which bears on the subject of *Responsa*. Unless, then, we were to have a double treatment of each period—an expedient which would make this course longer than a Term—we could not avoid this difficulty. But the consequences are not so very serious, given sincerity. To a fair-minded observer who wishes to look at both sides of a wall, it makes little difference on which side he plants his ladder: he is bound to see one side more easily than the other and, for this very reason, he will be the more careful, perhaps, in his scrutiny of the opposite one.

This balance of judgement, combined with a sympathetic appreciation of the standpoint of others, was pre-eminently the characteristic of the late Israel Abrahams. His great learning was never misapplied nor were isolated examples ever given undue weight to win a case. It is remarkable how his work stands the test of time, how it is fresh and inspiring whenever re-read. Readers may, therefore, be surprised that his *Studies in Pharisaism* have not been frequently cited by me. This omission was deliberate. I am deeply conscious of his influence and to it I attribute any value—if there be any—in my work. But unless I was to make this *Introduction* a series of extracts from his book, I had no choice but to leave that book on the shelves. Now that my *Introduction* is written, I realize its shortcomings the more vividly. I ask readers to turn to *Studies in Pharisaism* and to the *Legacy of Israel* as correctives and always to take their word against mine. If this sounds hyperbole, in an age which prefers what it terms “debunking” to adequate reverence for scholarship, good taste and judgement, I stand firm. The name

of the righteous remains for a blessing: of an evil report he shall not be afraid.

It is my task to outline some of the ideas which we propose to examine. It may well be that succeeding lecturers will limit themselves only to certain of those that I mention: the field is very large. Ideas that may be prominent and interesting at one epoch may call for no comment at another, when they may have passed away without a trace or when they have become universally adopted. I am, therefore, in a serious dilemma. Either I must omit certain aspects or, if I aim at comprehensiveness, I must limit myself to a bare catalogue, without discussing the items. If I choose the latter alternative, there is no escape from dullness: even Homer's catalogue of ships is not the favourite reading of Classical scholars. If I omit certain aspects, one of my successors may be left hanging in the air. To avoid such a terrible contingency, let me change the unpleasant metaphor and say, rather, that I have to stand up to the bowling and that I shall hit certain catches into the deep field. When I speak of the Pharisaic Sabbath, the ultimate repercussions may be the Victorian Sunday or even the Seventh Day Adventists or the Dunkers. If I mention the divergence of Pharisaic opinion on the question of divorce, I am liable to be reminded that Hillel's view, in a certain sense, is being advocated by Mr A. P. Herbert to-day. This is as it should be, and I trust I shall offer plenty of scope to those who are to follow: but this does not mean that they are in any way limited by the confines of these present remarks. There are, however, two points which cause me grave misgivings. First of all, lack of time will prevent my giving evidence for many

assertions. But my sense of responsibility will be all the keener, and I shall be glad to furnish inquirers with references to passages which corroborate my statements. Secondly, it will be necessary for me to go over much of the ground which I covered in my lecture¹ last Term. But at the time when that lecture was first announced, this series was not contemplated. I trust, however, to touch on some fresh aspects as well as to avoid, at least partially, the charge of "vain repetitions".

The *terminus a quo* may conveniently be taken as the Return. By that time certain preliminary tendencies had taken definite shape. We need not concern ourselves with the growth of the Pentateuchal documents, we can almost begin to speak of the Pentateuch as we know it. But we must remember that we are selecting arbitrarily a given point in the progress of ideas; from their primitive beginnings we have already travelled far. The Return is, after all, but a late stage in the religious and cultural journey, when we look back to Ras Shamra and Hammurabi, to say nothing of far distant Neanderthal. For our purpose, however, the Return is the most useful starting-point.

Similarly too, we must extend the *ad quem*. It will not do merely to treat of Pharisaism from Hyrcanus to Bar Kochba. That period may, no doubt, be regarded as central and, in many ways, principal. But we need to view a completed and developed Pharisaism, and we must place our limit at the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud, let us say, with due deference to L. Löw, at the end of the fifth century. This date will enable us to utilize Talmudic and Midrashic material, for the date of that material is often much earlier than

that of its codification; in the main, the first three Christian centuries will suffice for our purpose.

[Soon after the Return we begin to note² dim traces of an elusive body of scholars to whom is attached the title "Men of the Great Synagogue".] Into the ancient controversy which has raged round this phrase, it is unnecessary to enter here. It may be safest to adopt a middle course. We may be disposed to reject both extremes, the one which sees in the "Men of the Great Synagogue" a regularly constituted assembly, the other which categorically denies their existence.⁴ It will probably not be inaccurate to regard them as an informal group of scholars: possibly the title which is the subject of dispute was applied to them not by their contemporaries but by their successors and disciples. The origins of many an academic body are vague. Without accepting the myths which make Alfred and Cantaber the founders of Oxford and Cambridge, we can well believe that there were scholars on the Isis and the Cam before the universities were formally established. The well-known phrase *Sciat Universitas Vestra* did not, when first used, denote what we now call a University. But once the University was in being, it would naturally be inferred that bygone scholars in the distant ages had belonged to it, just as the Old Testament heroes were claimed for the pre-incarnation Church. But this does not mean that the scholars or the heroes in question were mere figments. So may it well have been with the "Men of the Great Synagogue". In the Talmudic literature we read of similar groups, such as the *Doreshe Reshumoth** and the

* See *T.B. Bab.K.* f. 82a (Germ. trs. G. vi, 296); *T.B. Sanh.* f. 104b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 463); *T.B. Ber.* f. 24a (Eng. trs. C.

Doreshe Ḥamurōth:⁵ then there was the ‘*Edah Kedoshah*,⁶ or “Holy Congregation”, which existed at the end of the second century A.D. and which included R. Jose b. Meshullam and R. Simeon b. Menasya. According to another account, these two scholars were the sole members of the “Holy Congregation”.* Now if so little was known to the Amoraic scholars about a relatively late group, not far removed from their own age, can we be surprised at our ignorance concerning the “Men of the Great Synagogue” who lived so much earlier, in a period about which precise information is so scanty?

It may, perhaps, not be too hazardous to suggest that the “Men of the Great Synagogue” were the descendants of Ezra’s scholars and the forerunners of the Pharisees, into whom they shade imperceptibly. Whether this be so or not, we know that the first religious task of the returning exiles was concerned with the Torah. Nehemiah viii is our evidence for this:

p. 158 and note). The *Doreshe Reshumōth* were Haggadists and their motto is well known; they said, “if thou desire to understand Him Who but spake and the universe was, learn Haggadah, for thus mayest thou understand God and cleave to His ways” (*Sifre*, ‘Ekebh, f. 85a). It is just possible—but no more—that the use of this term for the Deity implies a knowledge of the Philonian Logos (cf. *Aboth* v, 1 (Eng. trs. in P.B.S. p. 199)) and that the Haggadah of this school was more allegorical than that of the ordinary Haggadists. For an example see p. 69§.

Löw, I, 58, explains *Doreshe Reshumōth* as “Heraldiker, Siegelforscher”, and *Hamurōth* in the same way, “nur dass diese Benennung nicht vom Siegel, sondern vom Siegelabdrucke ausgeht”. This interesting suggestion deserves careful consideration.

* This seems to be the view of T.J. *Ma’aser Sheni* II, § 10, f. 53d, l. 4 (French trs. S. vol. III, 218). See also Maimonides, *Introd.* to *Mishnah Zera’im*, towards end, in *haggahah* on *הרמקבל*, where the term is not ‘*Edah Kedoshah* but the Aramaic equivalent, *Kehala Kaddisha*.

this chapter presupposes some existing Pentateuchal text, for it deals with public reading and exposition. Whether this was our Pentateuch is another matter. The institution of the lectionary is attributed to Ezra and his company.* We read in the *Sifre*⁷ and elsewhere of Temple manuscripts containing variant readings, which were collated,† the reading of the majority being adopted. This points to editorial work. Briefly, the first and most important achievement of the Pharisaic Age may be said to be the provision of a Bible and its essential accessories. "To the prophets it had been given to make the religion of Israel, but the Scribes made the Bible."⁸ [If we take the period from Ezra

* See, for example, *T.B. Bab.K.* f. 82a (Germ. trs. G. vi, 296): for this question see Büchler's artt. in *J.Q.R.* (O.S.), 1894, vol. vi, and St John Thackeray's *Schweich Lectures*. See *Sifre*, 'Ekebh, § 48, f. 84b, an interesting section on the continuity of tradition from Ezra to Akiba, "lest the Torah be forgotten".

† It is stated that in R. Me'ir's Torah, the reading in Gen. i, 21 "And God saw...and behold, it was very (*me'odh*) good" was, "and behold, death (*maweth*) was good" (*Gen.R.* ix, § 5 (Germ. trs. W. p. 37)). This may have been a marginal gloss or, merely, a homiletical note: it does not look like a genuine textual variant. For such, see *me'on* and *me'onah* in vol. i, p. 108, n. 2. On the other hand, there may be a genuine variant, of Me'ir's tradition, in Gen. xlvi, 23, where, we are told, he read "the son of Dan was *Hushim*", M.T. "sons". See *Gen.R.* xciv, § 9 (Germ. trs. W. p. 467). Ed. Wilna has תורין for תורתן, see *Addenda*, p. 57. It may be, as suggested by the commentators, that this variant was influenced by the plural verb in II Sam. xxiv, 6. In Midrash Samuel, towards end (ed. Buber, f. 48b, see his note), the variant differs from that given in *Gen.R.* Einhorn, in his comment on *Gen.R.*, thinks that Me'ir had a marginal gloss of a homiletic nature, suggesting that *Hushim*, written defectively, might be *Hashim*, "pained or heavy in the head, weak in faith, tending to idolatry". Another difficulty is to reconcile the numbers in the genealogy (*minyan*), and this may have been the basis of Me'ir's variant. Me'ir was a scribe and wrote many scrolls.

till the end of the first Christian century and examine its work on the Bible, we shall note a remarkable constructive activity. First, we have the editing and collation of the pre-exilic and exilic biblical material. But for Ezra, the Men of the Great Synagogue, and their followers, we might have been dependent on the *Alexandrinus*, the *Vaticanus* or the *Sinaiticus* for our knowledge of the Pentateuch and many other parts of the Bible: the Hebrew originals might have been lost to us. The moral of certain books of the Apocrypha, of which only versions have survived, is significant. Secondly, there is the post-exilic material itself, and this is an item of very considerable importance.] Think of the post-exilic Psalter alone! "As a father loveth his sons, so the Lord loveth them that fear Him." "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell in unity." "The eyes of all look expectant to thee, Thou givest them their food in due season." These and similar pearls came to us in the period which gave Pharisaism birth. Think also of Chronicles, with its noble prayers and devout doxologies, with the story of Manasseh's repentance that Kings does not tell us; think of the heroism of Daniel and of the self-sacrifice of Esther; of the Wisdom literature, of the tender lyrics in Canticles, which sing the praises of true love that gold cannot buy nor many waters quench. Think, again, of Jonah's lesson in Universalism and of the first clear statement of immortality which Daniel's last chapter contains. These are a few samples of what we owe to this epoch, a truly golden age, if oft decried.* [Thirdly, we note the institution of the

* On this, see a significant passage on p. 409 of Montefiore's *H.L.* This great book, which grows young with age, is a never

Lectionary. Fourthly, there are the various translations into Greek and Aramaic.⁷ How far, if at all, the impetus that produced the Septuagint was *au fond* Pharisaic, is doubtful. But the Septuagint provoked the controversies which resulted in the versions of Aquila and Onkelos, about the Pharisaism of which there can be no uncertainty. Fifthly, this rivalry of translations is indicative of much biblical study and conflicting schools of exegesis.⁸ We have mentioned the *Doreshe Reshumoth*, “the Investigators of the written things”, i.e. the Scriptures, and the *Doreshe Hamuroth* or *Homeroth*, “the Investigators of difficulties”, possibly allegorizers, who considered that the *Homer*, or weight of the Torah, lay, not in the plain letter but in the spirit. We hear of *Abba had-Doresh*,⁹ Abba the Exegete, and so we reach the term Midrash, familiar to us from the Books of Chronicles.¹⁰ Sixthly, the Pharisaic era was responsible for the Old Testament Canon.¹¹ Here, then, in the first group, that is to say in the sphere of the Bible, there is abundant material for the consideration of those who are to follow me. What was the reaction of later—or contemporary—cultures to Pharisaic exegesis? That exegesis comprised different schools, such as those which held what we may term literal inspiration, e.g. Akiba, the pupil of Nahum of Gimzo, who taught that every *Akh* and *Rak* (“but” and “only”) had a lesson to convey, i.e., the principles of *ribbui* and *me’ut* (inclusion and exclusion).¹² Then there was the School of Ishmael, who differed from Akiba and who held that more than jots or letters were necessary for determining the sense of a passage. For his motto was failing source of ideas, not only for the Rabbinic but also for the biblical period.

that the Torah speaks in human language and that grammatical pleonasm, such as the strengthening infinitive absolute, must not be given undue deductive authority. The schools of thought typified by Akiba and Ishmael had influence on the mediaeval commentators Rashi and Ḳimḥi. Rashi, in turn, through the agency of Nicholas de Lyra's *Postilliones*, had influence on Luther.

Si Lyra non lyrasset
Lutherus non saltasset

as the old tag has it.¹² Again, of Ḳimḥi you will remember Dr Abrahams' saying, "there was no Jewish scholar among those responsible for the A.V., but the spirit of Ḳimḥi sat at their table".* Are not the differences between Ishmael and Akiba to be observed in many successive ages? Principles stand, though details change. We have the literalists and the rationalists† to-day. Among the various types of Pharisaic exegetes there were mystics like Ben Yohai, whose teachings remind us somewhat of those of Swedenborg, there was the esoteric school, there were those who pinned their faith to *gematria* or *grammateia* (see p. 205), that is to say to the correspondence between the numerical equivalent of consonants and the words which they

* In an article on the Tercentenary of the A.V., in the *Jewish Chronicle* for 3 March 1911, Dr Abrahams remarks on the influence of Ḳimḥi, on the A.V. of Zechariah in particular.

† The Rabbis of old were just as acutely conscious of critical difficulties as are modern scholars: the fact that they propounded answers that are unsuitable to-day is of less significance than that they noticed something strange in the text. Thus, they observed discordance between genealogies, see, for example, *Num.R.* xxi, 8 (Germ. trs. W. p. 511). On this see also Canon Knox's lecture, p. 92 below and vol. I, p. 135, note 2.

formed.* The esoteric school used the method of permutation, by which the final letter of the alphabet was substituted for the first. Of this method, called *At-Bash*, the Bible furnishes examples in Jer. li, 41 and xxv, 26, where *Sheshakh* stands for *Babel*, and possibly in the word for Chaldaeans in li, 1. A somewhat similar device, in which the alphabet is bisected, not reversed, has given us the word *Album*, which denotes the equation $A = L$, $B = M$,† for an album was once a repository of personal secrets rather than a "White

* In *T.J. Ber.* II, § 4, f. 5a, line 13 (Eng. trs. S. p. 44) the Messiah's name, *Menaḥem*, is thus equated with *Šemah*, branch, as the consonants of each word have the same numerical value. Whether an actual person called *Menaḥem* was in the mind of R. Yudan b. Aibo, who made this statement, is doubtful. In *T.B. Šanh.* 98b (Germ. trs. G. VII, 430) *Menaḥem* is the son of Hezekiah, because of Lam. i, 16. It is interesting to note that *Menaḥem* = comforter = ὁ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγίου ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ (Joh. xiv, 26). In the *Kur'an* (LXI, 6) Muhammad says: "And...Jesus, the son of Mary, said 'O Children of Israel. Verily, I am the apostle of God to you, verifying the law that was before me and giving you glad tidings of an apostle who shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad'." Muslim commentators point out that Ahmad is equivalent in meaning to Muhammad and means "Praised", "Laudable". The allusion is to the promise of the Paraclete in Joh. xvi, 7, the Muslims declaring that the word *παράκλητος* has been substituted in the Greek for *περικλυτός*, which would mean the same as Ahmad (Rodwell's trs. and note).

The passage in the Jerusalem Talmud should be studied: it is of interest in connection with the story of the Magi in Matthew ii and the messianic use of Micah v, 1 (English, 2).

Other interesting examples of esoteric cryptograms used in eschatological connections, are the curious interpretations, by complicated *At-Bash*, of *Mene Tekel*, in *T.B. Šanh.* 22a (Germ. trs. G. VII, 83). See Goldschmidt's note and diagram. What לְגַנְגָן was supposed to mean is doubtful. It is possibly intended merely as a pattern of a code. Cf. *Cant.R.* III, 4 (Germ. trs. W. pp. 82-3).

† See p. 57, *Addenda*.

Book".* A well-known example is contained in the *Assumption of Moses* (A.D. 6), where "Taxo or Taxo(c) is almost certainly derived from an artificial mis-writing of Eleazar, taking the next letter in the Semitic alphabet".¹³ The purpose of these cryptographic systems was to secure privacy.† Mystic doctrine was not for the multitude. The first chapter of Ezekiel was not, at one time, allowed to be expounded publicly.‡¹⁴ Jesus charged his disciples not to disclose certain intimate subjects. Similarly, of *grammateia* also we have an instance, in the mark of the beast, 666 standing, possibly, for *Nero Kaisar*, in Rev. XIII, 18 and XVI, 2. This method is not so bizarre as it might seem, when we recall that no symbols for numerals existed and that subconsciously, therefore, one had to examine a given group of letters and decide whether they stood for consonants or for arithmetical figures. To-day, when we see such a group of letters as CIVIL, we do not have to perform the mental operation of deciding whether the group means $101 + 6 + 50$, or a word. But in the past, instinctively, we would have associated the conception of civility with the number 157. This excuse, however,

* In *T.B. Šuk.* 52b (Germ. trs. G. III, 148), there is an instance of *At-Bah*. Here the consonants are paired numerically, so as to form multiples of 10 ($1+9$, $2+8$). Thus, $10+90=100$; $20+80=100$; $\gamma''\delta$, $900+100=1000$; $\delta''\gamma$, $800+200=1000$. See Goldschmidt's note *in loc.* The Talmudic example equates *Manon* and *Sahadah*: so cryptic a cypher would not easily be understood by the uninitiated and secret teaching would be safe.

† Compare the cryptic letter sent to Raba, about a "Yoke which the eagle had seized", i.e. a pair of scholars captured by Rome, in *T.B. Sanh.* 12a (Germ. trs. G. VII, 38).

‡ The mysticism of Ezekiel and its difficulties to the Rabbis are admirably and fully discussed by S. Spiegel, in *Harv. Theol. Rev.* for 1931, vol. xxiv, pp. 245 ff. I regret that this learned study has only just come to my notice.

is not available to those who would, to-day, interpret the Bible and solve all human problems by the dimensions of the great Pyramid or by Baconian cryptograms.

Another device was called *Noṭarikon* (*νοταρικόν*), of which there is a well-known example in *Aboth* vi, § 2.* This was a type of shorthand, only one letter, not necessarily the initial, of each word, being written: it was not genuine shorthand, of which at least one example exists in the Cambridge Genizah, in the form of an abbreviated Bible text, probably intended for school use. *Noṭarikon* was not employed for halakhah, only for haggadah, and it was esoteric in character. It was used to interpret difficult biblical words, e.g. *Paḥaz*, in Gen. XLIX, 4 (A.V. "unstable": ἐξίβρυος) is explained as *Paḥazta*, *Hata'ha*, *Zanitha*, "thou wast lascivious, thou sinnedst, thou wast adulterous".†

We cannot now pause to consider other groups, which fade away towards gnosticism and elsewhere. But we may ask ourselves, what happened to all this study of the Bible when it crossed the frontiers of Palestine? What happened to the versions? Above all, what was the effect of the institution of the Canon and the adoption of certain Sadducean material—with suitable modification, the exclusion of other Sadducean literature, of Judaeo-Christian literature and of all Apocalypse, save for the Book of Daniel and fragments incorporated in the prophets? How much

* Eng. trs. *P.B.S.* p. 205.

† *Tanh.*, *vayehi*, § 9, f. 76a, Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 291.

For other examples, see *T.B. Sab.* 105a (Germ. trs. *G.* I, 565 ("I am", in the Decalogue)); *Tanh.B.*, *va'-era'*, § 8, f. 13a (The Ten Plagues). For *Šemukhim* see Levy, *s.v.*; for other systems, *J.E.* *s.v.* Talmud, Hermeneutics; Strack's *Introduction*, Philadelphia, 1931, Ch. xi, pp. 93 foll., also ib. p. 265, note 96.

passed over to Christianity? What circumstance determined the inclusion into the Old Testament Canon? Did Pharisaism kill Apocalypse or did it die a natural death³⁶? (see p. 30). Did it reappear subsequently, perhaps when Islam arose, and can we trace its influence in portions of the *Kur'an*? *

The idea of God which prevailed in the Pharisaic period was very different from that which it is not infrequently stated to have been. From a recent Hulsean sermon,† we might gather that the Pharisaic God, that is to say the ancient Israelite God, untempered by the moderating influence of Christianity, was cruel, capricious and revengeful. [But if ever there was an age which stressed the mercy of God, it was the Pharisaic, when the phrases "Our Father, our King", "Our Father which art in heaven" grew up.] That there was progress in conceptions of the Deity is

* See Rosenthal's remarks on Eschatology on p. 154 below.

† See *Cambridge Review* for 17 Jan. 1936. See the passage cited from Montefiore's *Synoptic Gospels* in vol. I, p. 184.

The difficulty felt by the preacher has been answered in many Rabbinical passages of which the following may be cited as a sample:

"God revealed Himself at the Red Sea as a hero waging war, and at Sinai as an old man full of compassion (*Exod. xxiv*, 10), even as it speaks in Daniel (vii, 9) of the Ancient of Days; but to the words 'the Lord is a man of war', the Scripture adds, 'the Lord is his name' [i.e. His true essence]: it is the same God in Egypt, the same God at the Red Sea, the same God in the past, the same God in the future, the same God in this world, the same God in the world to come, as it says, 'See now that I, even I, am he' [i.e. ever the same] (*Deut. xxxii*, 39), and 'I, the Lord the first, and with the last I am the same' (*Isa. xli*, 4)" (*Mech.*² p. 130): the passage in full may be seen in *L.* (with Eng. trs.), II, 31, and again on p. 231. Cp. also *Exod.R.*, *Shemot*, iii, § 6 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 41): ib. *Yithro*, xxviii, § 5 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 207 (wrongly paginated)): *Tanh.*, *Shemot*, f. 88b.

natural; it is, however, unscientific to decry one era, not on the basis of evidence, but in order to heighten a succeeding one. It is interesting to see how moral difficulties in the earlier portions of the Bible were treated: that they were treated at all is the important thing. The answers provided will not usually satisfy this generation, but what is noteworthy is that the difficulties were appreciated.¹⁵ It must be remembered that Palestine lacked entirely the philosophical atmosphere of Greece.* The Wisdom literature is gnomic rather than systematic: it has, moreover, a moral rather than an intellectual basis; not the "know thyself" of Socrates or the "I searched myself" of Heraclitus, but "The beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord" was the Jewish approach to metaphysical problems. Thus ethics is the first and thought the second consideration. Not until centuries had elapsed after the Jews became acquainted with Greek thought, can we speak of a Jewish theology. By remembering this deficiency, we can understand and solve not a few of the moral problems of the Bible. The Israelites had but a rudimentary idea of causes: the Hebrew vocabulary contains many words that mean both cause and effect. *Pe'ullah* is both "work" and "reward", the result of work. *Het'* means "punishment" as well as "sin". *Dam* is "blood" and, in the plural, "blood-guilt, fine". Sequence in time was held to be the same as sequence in cause. Therefore, the compiler of II Kings connects two events which happened on the same day, Elisha's journey to Carmel and the death of the children at Bethel who were eaten by bears. *Post hoc ergo propter hoc.* Elisha, who healed the widow's

* See vol. I, pp. 120 and 155; and below, p. 74.

son, would not have cursed little children. The historian enlarges what was probably a playful rebuke, not merely, in the words of Pooh-Bah, to add artistic verisimilitude. His theology forbade him to regard the intrusion of the bears as an accident due to natural causes, and therefore he was bound to seek the divine intervention. Thus, mere chronological sequence becomes an active factor. It is surprising that this lack of discrimination between real and accidental causes did not do more harm. The Pharisee did not, in consequence, think of God as sending bears to eat naughty children. The lofty conceptions of God's Fatherhood and His Transcendence stand out in the greater relief. The Greek, says Sir R. W. Livingstone,¹⁶ started at the bottom of the ladder, with rain magic and crop magic: he believed that the sun and moon were gods and that the winds were produced by Zeus from a leather bag: he created a civilization based on the scientific attitude to life. Democritus' idea that the universe consists of atoms in infinite space or Anaximander's anticipation of Darwin are examples of the heights which the Greek attained. His scientific progress tended to purify his conceptions of his gods. But the Pharisee had a higher conception of God without the intellectual stimulus possessed by the Greek. Crude though the Pharisee's notions of the world might be, of God's righteousness, love and providence he had no uncertainty. He had a finer spiritual heritage upon which to draw. That God did not want human sacrifice he knew long before the Greek, from the story of Abraham on Moriah. Now Gen. xxii, 1-14 comes from the E document, the latest date of which is considered to be 750 B.C. Yet though Euripides, in

protest against Agamemnon's offering of his daughter, wrote the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, in which the victim had been saved by Artemis and a fawn substituted, the play could not be produced till after his death* (406 B.C.). Ezekiel and Jeremiah introduced the doctrine of personal responsibility, while the Greek still struggled with the spectre of inherited guilt. Orestes, innocent of crime, is forced to matricide and is pursued by the Furies. And in the sphere of morals we recall that Socrates regarded with but slight deprecation that sin of Alcibiades which, to the Pharisee, was infamy unspeakable, but to the average Greek normal behaviour. Yet, we must beware of injustice to Socrates and we must not overlook Plato's *Laws*, 835–842, especially 841.

[The attitude towards the miraculous, inside and outside of Judaism, offers a fruitful field of study.] Here only a few points may be outlined. First of all we must draw a distinction between post-biblical and biblical miracles. With regard to both it may be said that there was a strong tendency among the Rabbis to limit the sphere of the miraculous. The biblical miracles were naturally accepted; of this there was no question, they were in the Bible. But their acceptance was held not to be incompatible with a belief that God's immutable natural law was not impugned. [Miracles were said to have been fore-ordained.] When God created the sea, he made a "condition" with it that it

* This is unproven. "Euripides... was bound to the motive of the Greek legend and was obliged to conclude with the foundation of the Attic worship." In the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, which was certainly brought out after the death of Euripides, the epilogue describing how Artemis redeemed Iphigeneia is spurious (R. C. Jebb in *Encycl. Brit.* 11th ed. ix, 904).

was to be split before the passage of the Israelites.* This ingenious attempt to show that the harmony of nature was not interrupted was a favourite exegetical device in the eleventh century. It is scarcely necessary to recall the well-known list in *Aboth*¹⁷ of certain things which would not fit into the scheme of the six days' creation. Hence they were said to have been created on the eve of Sabbath.

One can observe a common desire to rationalize miracles.† With regard to post-biblical miracles, we

* Cf. *Gen.R.* v, § 5 (Germ. trs. W. p. 19). “R. Johanan said: God (at the time of creation) made conditions (*תנאים*) with the sea that it should be rent before Israel (at the due moment), for it says ‘the sea returned according to its conditions’ (Exod. xiv, 27, *לעתנו* read, by metathesis, as *לעתנאי*)...and not only with the sea but with all that was created in the Beginning....” It is implied that every apparent break of the natural order was not really a break at all, since the order had been so contrived as to comprise this exceptional occurrence. The whole of the passage should be studied. On the other hand, Simeon b. Gamaliel held that the manna was an interference with the natural order (*שנה מעשה בראשית*) as a sign of grace (*Yalkut* on Exod. xvi, 4, § 258). God “changes the natural order” (the same phrase) for the righteous, who “change” their acts (i.e. “for penitents”) (*Sifre*, ‘Ekebh, § 47, f. 83b).

† One must not draw generalizing distinctions between Judaism and Christianity in regard to this question, facile though it be to do so. It is, for example, obvious that between the architectural austerity of the Synagogue and the usual ecclesiastical decorations of a Roman Catholic Church, there is a wide and obvious gulf. But a Presbyterian Chapel is as plain as a Synagogue and both can shew buildings possessing artistic merit as great as that of the more ornate Churches. There are no relics of saints in a Synagogue, but there are none in an Anglican Church: the sentence, cited on p. 22, about a *Bath Kol* would be echoed by many a Dissenter. Yet when we think of Socrates' *Daimon*, of Caro's “Mentor Angel”, as Schechter (*Studies*, II, 213) calls it, of George Fox's “Voices”, or of Joan of Arc's, of Francis of Assisi's visions, we cannot fail to notice a spiritual likeness between all these Saints. But the *Stigmata* of Francis are a different matter. It is

note plenty of legends and stories in the Rabbinic literature, but these belong to the Father Christmas, fairy tale, Oberammergau, Sindbad the Sailor types: they are not *de fide*. The Rabbis did not mean these stories to be taken literally. On the contrary, a man was warned never to incur danger and expect that a

important to remember that varieties of outlook may be found within the same confession. On the one hand, all Christians would agree with the following remarks of St John of the Cross in whom suspicion of all so-called "supernatural" revelations was carried to its extreme point. "In a passage which might have been written by a mid-Victorian evangelical, he asserts that the man who desires 'to know anything by extraordinary supernatural ways implies a defect in God, as if He had not given us enough when He gave us His only Son.... One good work, or act of the will, wrought in charity, is more precious in the eyes of God than that which all the visions and revelations of Heaven might effect. Many souls to whom visions have never come are incomparably more advanced in the way of perfection than others to whom many have been given'." (Cited from E. Herman, *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism*, London, 1922, p. 52.) One is reminded of the story of the Hasidic Rabbi Barukh of Medziboz who, when informed that a certain Saint had performed many miracles said "How utterly useless they are! When Elijah performed miracles, we are told that people exclaimed 'The Lord, He is God'. But nowadays people grow enthusiastic over the reputed miracle-worker and forget entirely to say 'The Lord, He is God'." (From L. I. Newman's *Hasidic Anthology*, New York and London, 1934, p. 260.)

On the other hand, in the Roman Catholic Church devotional practices and cults have on several occasions been originated or extended on the strength of visions. I am indebted to Father C. C. Lattey, S.J. for the following remarks:

(1) "'The Deposit of Faith' was closed at the end of the Apostolic age and the Church cannot invent a new dogma but can only preserve and explain and legitimately develop what she had already received by then.... The best authoritative pronouncement... is the condemned proposition... *Revelatio, obiectum fidei catholicae constituens, non fuit cum Apostolis completa*. Therefore a revelation later than the Apostolic age cannot be the object of the Catholic faith, cannot become a dogma, cannot be *de fide*

miracle would be worked for him.¹⁸ There is a famous saying that no attention is to be paid to a supernatural voice (*Bath Kol*): points affecting religion and life cannot be settled by appeals to miracles, the Torah is with us and is ever inspiring.* “Greater is the miracle

(see Denzinger’s *Enchiridion*, nos. 2021 and 2146: the proposition is the twenty-first condemned in the anti-modernist decree *Lamentabili*, 3 July 1907).”

(2) “When, however, you ask, ‘Has anyone ever attempted to change or initiate a practice in consequence of a vision?’ then the answer must be *yes*, several times. Lourdes itself is a case in point: the devotion to the Sacred Heart is another. But in these cases the Holy See has only examined the *historical* certainty of the vision and has never defined it. Catholics are free to doubt it if they will, though in view of the searching examinations made, etc., they would be considered foolish and discrediting, at all events as a general rule, though there might be real, conscientious doubters. What the Holy See does examine even more searchingly is the *dogmatic* bearing of the vision. Is the proposed vision or devotion at Lourdes entirely in harmony with the Catholic doctrine about Our Lady? Is the devotion to the Sacred Heart strictly in accord with the doctrine of the Incarnation? Any flaw *there* would lead to the devotion being condemned and suppressed at once.”

It seems that the difference lies rather in the willingness of the Roman Catholic Church to accept extensions of devotional usage than in any theoretical difference as to the doctrinal or dogmatic value of visions as such. It would, I think, be perfectly fair to say that the Jewish attitude to extra-scriptural miracles is, in practice, totally distinct from that of the Roman Church. Among the *Hasidim* a “Wonder-Rabbi” may operate, but between such cases and, for example, Lourdes, there can be no comparison. For the Jewish protests at the Oxford Shrine, see below, p. 200*. The views of Mendelssohn and of Newman about miracles were fundamentally different. But between Mendelssohn and many an Anglican divine, let us say, Kingsley, there would not have been much difference.

* Cf. *T.B. Ber.* 52a top (Eng. trs. C. p. 332); *T.B. ‘Erubin* 7a and 13b (Germ. trs. G. II, 17 and 40); *T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 59b (Germ. trs. G. VI, 678). On R. Joshua’s refusal to accept the miracle of the carob tree in *Bab. Meṣ.* 59b, Abrahams says, “Liberals have no interest in R. Joshua’s point of law, but his assertion of the

wrought to a sick man who recovers from his illness than that wrought for Ananias, Mishael and Azariah: for the fire from which they were saved came from man and could be put out by man. But the fire of fever comes from God.”¹⁹ “He to whom God has worked a miracle is unconscious of it.”²⁰

It is remarkable that in the liturgy only two references to post-biblical miracles are to be found and these are in hymns. One is on p. 275 of *P.B.S.*²¹ This is a reference to the miracle which is said to have happened when the Hasmonaeans entered the Temple. They are said to have found consecrated oil enough for one day only, yet the oil lasted for eight days. But in the official liturgical formula²² there is no mention of this story, the basis of which would appear to have been the similar miracle recorded in II Macc. 1, 18ff.

The other instance occurs in the Atonement hymn attributed to Hai Gaon on p. 12 in Gaster’s *Atonement* volume. Note the last reference to Hhony (Onias), a Saint who lived in 63 B.C. when Pompey came to Jerusalem. He is said to have stood in a circle and to have prayed for rain successfully.²³

The so-called miracles in *Aboth*²⁴ are hardly meant to be taken literally.

The cardinal point in the proper appreciation of the Divine Being must be an adequate understanding of His Immanence and His Transcendence. Unless this equipoise is maintained, the idea of the Godhead becomes one-sided. The Pharisee did not use such philosophical terms. He spoke of making God’s justice rights of private judgement interests Liberals very much” (*Permanent Values*, p. 84, Oxford, 1924).

and God's mercy* parallel. He was concerned in explaining how the One Who fills heaven and earth could speak to Moses between the staves of the Ark and how He could be found in the heart of the humblest worshipper.²⁵ By an ingenious paronomasia, God, when speaking to Job transcendentally from the whirlwind (*Še'arah*), at the same moment speaks to him in the closest possible relation between the very hairs (*Se'arah*) of his head.²⁶ Here Judaism and Christianity parted company.† The Christian solution was the Incarnation: the Pharisee propounded the theory of the *Middoth*, or the divine attributes. When he translated the Bible, he avoided, as far as possible, the application of human metaphor to the Deity.

The Targum strives and oft contrives with paraphrase complex
Lest crude anthropomorphisms the reader should perplex.

For outside the Synagogue and the class-room, the Meturgeman's hearers came face to face with statues of anthropomorphic deities whose worship entered largely into social life. Inside the Synagogue was the Jewish-Christian, to whom anthropomorphic passages in Scripture were welcome proof-texts, ammunition ready to hand for his controversial armoury. Here then, on the relation of God to man, we shall expect to find interesting developments when Pharisaism crosses the border and meets other systems.‡

[The belief in a future life may have come to the Pharisees from Zoroastrianism or it may have been discovered independently.] It is difficult to believe that

* Or, The attribute of justice and the attribute of mercy, *Middath had-Din* and *Middath ha-Rahamim*.

† See vol. I, p. 158, note 1.

‡ On Philo and the Logos, see Canon Knox's lecture, p. 68.

it was old and traditional: it is no less difficult to believe that it was not. On the one hand, Egypt and Assyria had this belief. On the other, it is lacking in many earlier passages of the Bible. Even if we make Sadducaeanism responsible for such phrases as "Not the dead shall praise God" or for the attitude of Ecclesiastes,* we cannot so explain every passage which seems to imply that death is the end of all things. Nor can we understand the Sadducaean, i.e. the conservative rejection of immortality and the struggle of the Pharisees to carry this belief to general acceptance. One of the methods by which this result was achieved was by the introduction, into the beginning of the daily prayer, of a test-benediction.²⁷ This benediction contained the proof of the resurrection which was used by Jesus:²⁸ it was thus a declaration of belief which a Sadducee would shrink from proclaiming.† The success of the Pharisaic campaign may be illustrated by comparing the original text of the Mishnah *Sanh.* x, § 1²⁹ with the current one. The present text states that among those excluded from the world to come is the man who denies that the doctrine of the Resurrection is contained in the Pentateuch.‡ In the Cambridge

* On this, see pp. xliv sqq. of Dr A. Lukyn Williams' ed. of *Ecclesiastes* in the Cambridge Bible for Schools Series.

† Evidence on this point is also to be derived from *Ecclesiasticus* 11, which embodies an early form of the 'Amidah and which lacks the reference to immortality. Now this form is clearly Sadducaean, since it includes a thanksgiving to "Him that chooseth the sons of Zadok to be priests" (verse 9) and, incidentally, strengthens the derivation of *Sadducee* from Zadok, if this argument be accepted. See vol. I, pp. 110, 142 and 190 (*Addenda*).

‡ For a subsequent discussion, designed to establish the pentateuchal basis of the doctrine (i.e. that it is *min ha-Torah*), see T.B. *Sanh.* 91 b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 389).

manuscript edited by Lowe, the words *min hat-Torah* are absent and the sentence reads "he who denies the resurrection". This is clearly the original reading: it is that of Maimonides. The extra words were, no doubt, added, when everyone believed in the life to come and the phrase was meaningless. The controversy then was over the authority for the belief, not over the belief itself. But wherever the idea of the future life came from originally, it was the Pharisees who implanted it so firmly on the people that it has remained an integral element of Judaism and Christianity. It will be interesting to know whether it has ever been challenged.

[Pre-existence, which played so large a part in Christianity and Islam, is of minor importance in Judaism.³⁰ The Pharisees toyed with the idea, but no more.] The name of the Messiah, or one of the names, *Tinnon*, existed before the sun, on the basis of an obscure phrase in Ps. LXXII, 17, where, following the versions, we translate, "Let his name be established (*yikkon*) before the sun." It was taken as "Before the sun was, *Tinnon* was his name".* *Pes.* 54a³¹ speaks of

* R. Yannai's pupils used this as a pun, to compliment their teacher by ascribing to him Messianic qualities (*Tinnon* = *Yannai* = Messiah); this, incidentally, shows that often no divine constituent was deemed to be inherent in the Messiah's personality, or such a compliment could not have been employed. See *T.B. Sanh.* 98b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 430); *Shohar Tobh* 93, f. 207b (Germ. trs. W. p. 85); *Pirke de R. Eliezer*, ch. xxxii (Eng. trs. ed. G. Friedlander, p. 233, London 1916), where *Tinnon* "will awaken those who sleep at Hebron". In the *Sanh.* passage, a similar pun is made, by R. Shela's pupils, on Shiloh. Such puns must not be overstressed. Did not Dryden, in dedicating his *Annus Mirabilis* to the "Metropolis of Great Britain", in its representatives the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs, say, in cold, sober prose "You are now..., as far as humanity can approach, a great emblem of the suffering Deity"!

seven things that were created before the world, the Torah, Repentance, Eden, Gehenna, the Throne of Glory, the Temple and the Messiah's name. But all this means that God created the world according to plan,³² just as, in Prov. viii, 22, He created it in wisdom, facts which no one would dispute, and which never gave rise to theological controversy. Even if in this list of spiritual qualities there is included one material object, the Temple, its presence is either to be explained as an expression of a concept, i.e. as the scheme of worship pre-ordained, or else we must look to the Platonic theory of ideas, as did Islam when it taught that the "Mother-Book" of the *Kur'an* was eternal. It may have been the survival of an ancient Oriental belief that was allowed to stand because it was not taken seriously. The question of pre-existent temples is discussed in Holmes's note on Wisd. ix, 8 in Charles's edition of the Apocrypha.

Attaching to the belief in the future life is the question of Reward and Punishment in the hereafter. Antigonus of Socho, who comes at the very beginning of the authorities in the Ethics of the Fathers, taught, "Be not like servants who serve the master for the sake of a reward."³³ It is said, with some doubt, that this means that the new world must not be called in to redress the balance of the old; virtue should be its own reward. But that the righteous would be recompensed in the future was generally taught and believed, sometimes finely, sometimes crudely. The tendency was usually to get man to regard himself neither as a thorough sinner nor as a perfect saint, but as an average person, whose disposition was so delicately poised that one act, in either direction, might engender habits

which would determine character.³⁴ It logically followed that if the perfect saint inherited life everlasting, eternal torment would be the lot of the perfect sinner. Yet it is noteworthy, that when, for the first time, the antithesis is plainly stated in the Bible, there is no mention of torment for the sinner. Dan. xii, 2 uses the difficult but milder words *Harafoth* and *Dera'on*, which the Oxford Lexicon renders by "Reproach" and "Aversion" (LXX. *εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς αἰσχύνην*).³⁵ These terms imply reprobation rather than torture: indeed, it is possible that Ps.-Saadya's rather puzzling comment means that the antithesis is between revival, accompanied by reward, and mere non-revival, i.e. annihilation. But whatever be the origin, eternal punishment became a *damnosa hereditas* in Judaism* and

* Compare such passages as *T.B. Rosh hash-Shanah* 17a (Germ. trs. G. III, 332). It should, however, be noted that references to Gehenna do not necessarily imply eternal punishment. Both *le-'Olam* and *aiώνιος* (as in *πῦρ aiώνιον*, Matt. xviii, 8) often seem to mean "a long time" rather than "eternal". Montefiore, in his note on Matt. xxv, 41 (*Syn. Gosp.*², II, 326) holds that if the eternal life for the righteous is to be everlasting, the converse must be true. Yet, as he also says, *ζωὴν aiώνιον* in Dan. xii, 2 is not correlated with *κόλασιν*. I venture to think, purely subjectively, I cannot give proof, that when thinking of reward, infinity, i.e. a fading away of time into realms beyond thought, was meant. "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting." "The measure (*middah*) of reward is far greater than that of sin." "Visiting the sins unto the third generation... shewing mercy to thousands." These and many similar passages seem to me to imply eternity. But if one asked a Rabbi—or Jesus—whether he really envisaged eternal punishment and equated the most grievous sin man could commit with God's smallest mercy, the answer would, I feel sure, have been the jettisoning of the perpetual element. Between "a very long time" and "eternity" there is a vast difference: so, too, *le-'Olam* as opposed to *le-'Oleme 'adh, le-'Alme 'Almaya, le-dhor wa-dhor*, etc. may indicate this same distinction. Judaism tacitly dropped the belief fairly soon.

Christianity which it took time to discard for good. Here it must suffice to say that one of the Pharisaic methods of avoiding the dilemma between the unforgiven sinner and the unforgiveable sin was to maintain that very few, if any sins, were beyond pardon, and that in the case of every one who, in fact, had committed the unforgiveable sin, there were compensating virtues which counteracted the extreme penalty. But I fear that in not a few cases this concession was reserved for Israelite sinners,* though it must be remembered that the discussions about this question are, for the most part, domestic; it is usually Israelites who are being considered. The larger question does not arise. Still, however we look at the subject, it is not

* Not always; thus: "It has been taught: If a man sees an idol, he should say, 'Blessed is He who is long-suffering to those who transgress His will.' If he comes to a place where idolatry has been rooted out, he should say, 'Blessed is He who has rooted out idolatry from our land. And so may it please Thee, O Lord, to root it out from all places, and to turn the hearts of idolators to serve Thee with a perfect heart.' But if one prays thus, is one not praying for the wicked? But R. Yochanan [by a homiletic interpretation of Eccles. ix, 4] said: Even for those who have lifted their hands against the Temple there is hope. Yet for them to live again is impossible, because they have lifted their hands against the Temple; to destroy them is impossible because they repented. Of them it is said, 'They shall sleep an everlasting sleep and shall not wake' (Jer. li, 39). And so, too, it is taught that the children of the nations and the armies of Nebuchadnezzar do not live again and are not judged, but they too sleep an everlasting sleep." (*Ruth R.* par. iii, 2 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 26.).)

The foregoing is cited ("It has been taught") from *T.B. Ber.* 57b (Eng. trs. *C.* p. 379), where the question is raised whether the blessing should be recited outside Palestine, "because most of the people there are Gentiles". R. Simeon b. El'azar held that it should be recited, because "in the future they will be converted, as it says, 'For then will I turn to the Gentiles a pure language' (*Zeph. iii, 9*)". "God does not rejoice at the death of the wickedⁿ¹."

pleasant, but it is the necessary concomitant of the doctrine of future reward. Unless we abandon the belief that personality survives, even in some form, or unless we adopt a form of purgatory, we can find no adequate solution, unless we are content to minimize even the most heinous sin, relative to the absoluteness of divine goodness and the irresistibility of God's mercy. This point I bequeath to my successors.

The doctrine of reward and punishment must have come to the fore with particular vividness in times of persecution. Thus, Daniel belongs to the Maccabaean age. With it is connected the growth of Apocalypse, which, as Burkitt used to say, grew up when things were at their worst and which were a hope of better days to come. Pharisaism had no great liking for Apocalypse; calculating the end was strongly deprecated.* The antithesis between Apocalypse and Halakhah, as constructed by Charles, is mainly unreal.³⁶ Apocalypse had its due place and filled it. In times of peace, sober thinking rather than mystic imagery is required. Rules for conduct are not antithetical to poetry. Those who remember Professor D. C. Simpson's inspiring introduction to *Myth and Ritual* will not need to be told that the tendentious contrast, so frequently drawn between priest and prophet, is largely exaggerated. History can show instances of mystic and law-maker in combination.† It is more true to say that Apocalypse died out with its need than that it was deliberately suppressed³⁶. Nor was the driving force of Apocalypse destroyed: it was di-

* On this point see p. 38*.

† E.g. the Safed School, which consisted of men who combined mysticism and legalism. See Schechter's essay on Safed in his *Studies in Judaism*, second series, Philadelphia, 1908, pp. 202 sqq.

verted. In Judaism, we see it in a certain type of Midrash: in Christianity, it suffices to recall the "Last Judgement" behind the Altar in the Sixtine Chapel.* But in neither religion did non-canonical apocalyptic writings achieve authority. Judaism rejected such literature entirely; the Church of Rome accepted the Alexandrine Apocrypha, roughly speaking the documents contained in Charles's vol. I, as canonical, while the Protestant Church regarded them as productive of edification though devoid of canonicity. Charles's second volume, *Pseudepigrapha*, was rejected by everybody. In the Church of Rome the position of the Apocrypha was subordinate to that of the Testaments. It is, however, noteworthy that the apocalyptic element in canonical Daniel often played a larger part in Protestantism than in Roman Catholicism.†

* *J.C.A.* p. 1.

† The term *Kabbalah* was sometimes employed for Hagiographa and even for the Prophets. In *T.d.B.E.* 135 it is applied to Isaiah; in *T.B. Rosh hash-Shanah* 7a (Germ. trs. G. III, 305 foot) to Esther and Zechariah. *Num.R.* xix, § 3 (Germ. trs. W. p. 463) is particularly instructive, as the right to found *Halakhah* on *Kabbalah* (in this case, Ezra) is questioned and rejected. It is upheld in *Tanh.B.*, *Re'eh*, f. 10a. Torah can=Prophets (*Mech.*², *Shirata*, vii, Eng. trs. L. II, 54) or Hagiographa (*Pes.R.* 9a; B.M. 83a): cf. νόμος=Ps. in John x, 34. For the order of the books in the Hagiographa, see *T.B. Bab. Bath.* 14b (Germ. trs. G. VI, 976).

The Apocryphal books strove for admission to the Canon and their admission is debated in *Yadayim* IV, § 6 (Eng. trs. D. p. 784) and rejected in *Sanh.* X, § 1 (Eng. trs. D. p. 397). For "Books of Hermes", instead of "Books of Homer", see below, p. 105.

Daniel is canonical and authoritative in Judaism: of that there is no doubt. Yet the book of Revelation is more prominent in Christianity than is Daniel in Judaism. Just because Daniel was utilized for calculating the end, a practice deprecated by the Rabbis, it fell somewhat into the background. In any case, the Hagiographa took some time to win authoritative recognition, cf., for example, *Gen.R.* VII, 2 (ed. Theodor, p. 52; Germ. trs.

It is largely from apocalyptic sources that angelology developed, though to look for it we need not go beyond the Bible. This is a subject which demands far more than the passing reference which, alone, time permits. Pharisaism gradually limited the scope of angels and demons. Among the factors which had helped to increase angelology was the shortage in Hebrew of abstract nouns, a circumstance painfully evident to those who attempt Hebrew composition in the *Tripos*. This deficiency does not exist to the same degree in Syriac, which, moreover, borrowed from Greek to make good its defects, though in any case it had a better native store on which to draw than Hebrew had. This paucity of the Hebrew vocabulary led to the device of personification. Just as in the Hebrew Bible one adjective, *Tame'*, had to signify physical uncleanness, ritual unfitness and medical infection, with the result that the ideas merged, so the spirit of uncleanness soon became a demon.* It is indeed

W. p. 28). It was Akiba who won canonicity for Ecclesiastes and Canticles, which he called Holy of Holies. St John Thackeray (*S.J.W.* p. 13) states that the Hagiographic books were translated into Greek later than the rest of the Bible because they stood on a lower level than the Law and the Prophets. It must, however, be pointed out that St John Thackeray, ib. pp. 80ff., maintains that the Book of Baruch was used liturgically on the 9th Ab. But though Ben Sira is occasionally quoted in the Talmud, Hebrew translations of the non-canonical Apocrypha never succeeded in being printed in the same volume as the Hebrew Scriptures. The British and Foreign Bible Society first excluded the Apocrypha from their non-Hebrew Bibles in 1827. For the Hagiographa and the Lectionary, see I. Elbogen's *Der Jüdische Gottesdienst*, 1931, pp. 184 ff. (*Vorlesungen aus den Hagiographen*). For the genesis of the Targum to the Hagiographa, see *T.B. Meg. 3a* (Germ. trs. *G. III*, 536). For Islam, see p. 155.

* See Büchler's chapter "The defiling force of sin in the Bible" (in his *Studies in Sin...*, Oxford, 1928): in his footnote to p. 278, he

remarkable how the wheel of time has revolved. In some of the medical passages, if we substitute germs for living demons who bring disease, we leave the substance of the passage with a modern ring. Empirical observation would suffice to cause the fact of contagion to be recognized, but the carrier of disease was regarded as a sentient superhuman agency, and not in the least as a blind microscopic bacillus.

Another source of angelology was the desire to interpose a mediator between the finite and the infinite. Here the Pharisees fought an unceasing battle. In the Targum the intermediaries, such as the Word, *Memra*, or *Logos*; the Presence, *Shechinah*; the Glory, *Ikara*, etc., are never independent entities detached from God. The Pharisees resolutely rejected a Demiurge, and although, according to Prov. viii, 22 Wisdom was present at the Creation of the World, she was very firmly kept in her place.* She never became more than a quality: her personification was but a poetical device and no more. A theological factor she did not become, until she was canonized as *Sancta Sophia*. This is a development of which we shall no doubt hear more next week.

The poetical angels of the Pharisees may best be observed in the liturgy. The morning prayer, said soon after dawn when the sun's rays are illumining the earth, begins with a thanksgiving to God who created the says, "this play of two essentially different meanings of clean and unclean reflects, to my feeling, non-Palestinian thinking".

* The same may be said of *Metatron*, who occupies a special position. In addition to the information given in the Encyclopaedias, etc., an excellent article by Burkitt may be consulted in *J.T.S.* xxiv, No. 94, for Jan. 1923.

One of the finest legends is that of *Metatron* teaching Torah to infants who die prematurely (*T.B. 'Ab. Zar.* 3b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 802)).

light.* This formula, taken from Isa. XLV, 7, was probably in origin used as a repudiation of dualism and hence as the setting for the *Shema'*, the declaration of the Unity.³⁷ Now since it is stated that it is God Who created light and Who is supreme over darkness, the luminaries are regarded as doing His work, as often in the Psalms. In other words, the natural forces are subject to God, not independent. And so, in the *Kedush-shah*³⁸ (*Te Deum*) man combines with the angelic forces of nature to praise God, though his praise is superior to theirs.† Again, we have the Sabbath angels,

* The *Therapeutae* prayed περὶ τὴν ἔω καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐσπέραν· ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντος εὐημερίαν αἰτούμενοι (Philo, *De Vita Cont.* M. 475, ed. F. C. Conybeare (Oxford, 1895), p. 63). Similarly, of the Essenes, Josephus says, "before sun-rising, they speak not a word about profane affairs but put up certain prayers which they have received from their forefathers" (*War.* II, ch. viii, 5, § 128). According to Kohler (*J.E.* v, 229) this account of Josephus is taken from Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium Haeresium*, where the sentence, cited above, is "At early dawn they rise for devotion and prayer and speak not a word to one another until they have praised God in hymns" (ix, 18–28; cited from *J.E.*). The prayers in question are probably the ordinary *Yoser*, see p. 92 below.

The *Wethikin* or *Wattikim* (pious; men of sound principles, "used to conclude the *Shema'* at sunrise" (*T.B. Ber.* 9 b (Eng. trs. C. p. 55); see Cohen's note in *loc.*). Cf. "We must rise before the dawn to give Thee thanks and must plead with Thee at the dawning of the light" (*Wisd. xvi*, 28). II Macc. x, 27–8 may not necessarily denote a custom, possibly only an emergency.

† In *Tanna de Be Eliyyahu* (ed. Friedmann, p. 34), God is said to declare, "I have four hundred and ninety-six myriads of ministering angels who stand before Me and declare the sanctification of My great name, daily, for all time: from the rising of the sun to the setting thereof they proclaim 'Holy, holy, holy'. And from the setting unto the rising, they say 'Blessed be the Lord's glory throughout all space' [lit. from His place, *Ezek.* III, 12]. And it is needless to add the Seventy Nations in the World [who do likewise]." The reference clearly is to the *Kedush-shah* in the *Yoser* (*P.B.S.* p. 39), where the Sun and Nature unite, before the *Shema'*, to sing the *Trisagion*.

who bring peace into the house where the Sabbath is kept: * these are Talmudic in origin. Angels are a poetic necessity: man cannot live without them. In the nineteenth century, when the storms raised by Darwin and Colenso demanded a sacrifice to lighten the ship, certain Synagogue authorities jettisoned angels from parts of the liturgy: I am glad to say that, like Jonah, they have returned. I believe, too, that in about the same period, angelology was discredited in some sections of the Church, but I note with pleasure that among my Christian friends, that highly respectable angel, Father Christmas, is still going strong.

Angels and saints suggest the question of images, about which I have nothing to say, since Pharisaic Judaism never had an iconoclastic controversy. † But the subject is bound to be discussed by subsequent lecturers.

Between angels and saints there is a line of demarcation. The Pharisees believed that the good which men do is not interred with their bones and so, by force of example and training, it affects their descendants. There is a heredity of good which is stronger than one of evil. For evil dies out after three generations at most, whereas good is, in theory, ever fecund. Thus there is a treasury of virtue left by the Patriarchs, who, since they live in the world to come, may pray for their posterity. But between this and the ordinary con-

* See the chapter (on Sabbath Angels) in the forthcoming (second) ed. of H. Loewe's *Mediaeval Hebrew Minstrelsy*, Cailingold, London.

† On the statue of the Persian King in the Synagogue in Shaf Yathib, in the district of Nehardea, mentioned in *T.B. Rosh hash-Shanah*, 24b (Germ. trs. G. III, 359), see Neubauer, *Géogr.* p. 350; Löw, I, 36-7.

ceptions of sainthood there is some difference. It may be summed up in the phrase "Original virtue", which is the title of a valuable book by S. Levy, in which he shows that sainthood becomes, in Judaism, the counterpart to original sin. It is well to recall that the Hebrew words so rendered by Levy are *Zekhuth Aboth*, literally, the merits of the patriarchs: but there is a parallel phrase of hardly less importance, *Zekhuth Banim*, the merits of the children, who can redeem their parents.* For Pharisaism looked far more to the future than to the past. Generally speaking there was to be no Second Coming; IV Esdras is almost exceptional.† Once the

* Thus, Korah was redeemed by the prayer of Hannah, whose husband, Elkanah, was descended from Korah, when she interceded for him, saying, "It is the Lord Who taketh down to Sheol but Who bringeth up" (I Sam. ii, 6), see *T.B. Sanh.* f. 109b (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 493); *A.R.N.* version I, ch. 36, f. 54a; *Num.R.* xviii, 13 (in some texts, 11) (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 446); *Midr. Shoker Tobi*, Ps. xlvi, § 4, ed. Buber, f. 135b (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 291).

It is stated in *Num.* xxvi, 11, that "the sons of Korah died not". On this see ibn Ezra's commentary, *in loc.*, also Targum and Rashi. The Midrash *Num.R.* (xviii, 5 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 438)) illustrates this by Jacob's dying request (*Gen. XLIX*, 6) that his name be not connected with the secret sins and plots of Levi's descendants: "'Sovereign of the Universe!' Neither in the matter of the spies nor in the schism of Korah let my name be mentioned, [hence, in *Num.* xvi, 1 Korah's pedigree stops at Levi], but when let it be mentioned? When they [the 'Sons of Korah', the Psalmists] claim kinship with me and take their stand on the Temple platform. Then it says (I Chron. vi, 22-3) '...the son of Tahath, the son of Assir, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, the son of Israel'." It will be noted that the foregoing differs somewhat from *W.*'s version.

See also *T.B. Sab.* 33b (Germ. trs. *G.* i, 395).

See also the comment on the "descendants" of Noah (*Gen.* vi, 9) in *Tanh.*, Noah, f. 15a (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 38). For an interesting reference to the "Merits of the Patriarchs", as promoting divine revelation in the diaspora, see *Mekh.^a* i, 5 (with Eng. trs.).

† But cf. *Pes.K.* 49ab, Germ. trs. *W.* p. 58.

Messianic age was reached, its power would be supreme and evil would be dead. Of this there would be no doubt, since the earth would be full of the fear of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. The Messianic ideal was often conceived as coming gradually, not catastrophically;* universally and imperceptibly, not necessarily associated with a person. One often hears the ridiculous statement that the Pharisaic conception of a Messiah implied the advent of a victorious leader

* Cf. "There will be no difference between this world and the days of the Messiah, except that the subjection (of Israel) by heathen kingdoms will come to an end", *T.B. Ber.* 34b (Eng. trs. C. p. 231). Cf. also *T.B. Sanh.* 98b, for a statement that the Messiah had come already in the days of Hezekiah (Germ. trs. G. vii, 429). On the other hand, opposite views, of a catastrophic change, called "the birth-pangs of the Messiah", occur often, e.g. *T.B. Sanh.* 97a and 98b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 419 and 428). See also above, p. 26.

The *Sanhedrin* passage is sometimes taken—I think wrongly—to refer to a Hezekiah *redivivus*. J. Klausner's excellent book, *Messianische Vorstellungen d. Jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter d. Tannaiten* has, I regret, not been available to me.

There are several passages which seem to imply a gradual improvement of human nature or fidelity to Torah, which will bring about the Messianic era. E.g. "If Israel kept but two Sabbaths properly they would be redeemed": this is said by Simeon b. Yoḥai who was a fugitive from persecution in the time of Hadrian (see *T.B. Sabb.* 118b (Germ. trs. G. i, 604): and parallels). The citation, just given, from *T.B. Ber.* 34b is very often repeated. Such a phrase as "As for the King Messiah, whether he be among the living or the dead" (*T.J. Ber.* II, § 4, f. 4a, line 11 (Eng. trs. S. p. 44)) is significant. But in any case the "Messiah" is not the same as the "Messianic age". Thus, *T.B. Sabb.* 113b (Germ. trs. G. i, 591) speaks of "This world, the days of the Messiah (*Yemot ham-Mashiah*) and the future to come ('*Athidh Labho*)."¹ The resurrection of the dead has also to be fitted into an eschatological scheme. The "days of the Messiah" are differentiated from the "World to come" (*Olam hab-Ba*) in *T.B. Sanh.* 91b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 388) and 99a (G. vii. 431). In the latter passage, the "days of the Messiah" are 7000 years. as the period from "the creation of the world until the present".

and no more. This is a vicious half-truth. Naturally, when evil reigned supreme there were those who thought that evil must be overthrown before good could triumph. But the overthrow was but *pars pro toto*. Antichrist defeated could never, by himself, be a substitute for Christ regnant, even though his preliminary defeat was an essential to the coming of the Kingdom. It would be very unfair to urge, on the basis of I Cor. xv, 25, that the words "He must reign till he has put all enemies under his feet" mean that the Christian doctrine of the Messiah implies that only an earthly conqueror was expected. Yet this line of argument is frequently used about the Jewish Messiah in some not yet antiquated theological books. The evidence usually given is Akiba's regarding Bar Kochba as a Messiah, as though this stamped the entire Pharisaic eschatology. How many Christian sects have believed in an imminent Second Advent! Eccentric some of them may certainly have been, but it would be wrong to maintain that their ideals were necessarily debased because these sects thought that their expectations would soon be realized. It is well to recall that Akiba was not followed by all his colleagues.* But sin must pass away before good can come. Is it possible to make peace with Satan? "God says, 'I and the proud man cannot live together in the world'" is a well-known Pharisaic adage.³⁹ But this was not all: the prophetic vision of the golden age to come was ever

* Cf. *Jer. Ta'an.* iv, § 8, f. 68d, l. 48 (French trs. S. vi, 189). Eschatological calculations were deprecated, cf. *Tanh.*, vay-Yera, § 6, f. 34a (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 122). An interesting passage in *T.B. Meg.* 3a (Germ. trs. *G.* iii, 536) shows that the Targum of the Hagiographa was disliked in some quarters because it "revealed the end". For Islam, see below, p. 177†.

before them, and it has been the sustaining force of their descendants through centuries of persecution.

The belief that the ultimate future would mean the reconciliation of man to man tended to stress the growth of universalism. If in the future, why not now? It would be too much to expect this ideal completely to subjugate the evils of particularism, especially in any age of fierce theological strife, persecution and war. We must not, however, over-emphasize particularism and see it everywhere. To some people, Jewish particularism is an *idée fixe*. The name of Nehemiah, for example, at once evokes this conception in them. They cite his divorce law as a typical instance of Jewish exclusiveness. Yet this law had, with great reluctance, to be enforced as a vital need, if religion was to be preserved.* Was England particularist because the sanctity of marriage and the suitability of the wife was the paramount issue between people and King in December 1936? Jews think of Nehemiah otherwise. Of the average congregation, probably not one man in fifty has read the last chapter of Nehemiah and is aware of the divorce law. But every Synagogue attendant, man, woman and child, knows, almost by heart, Nehemiah's great prayer in chapter ix, for it occurs in the daily morning service, before the Song of Moses.⁷² This prayer is addressed to God as the Creator of the universe, to whom every human being owes his life (ix, 6). It is of this universalist theme and the recognition of Jewish sinfulness (ix, 16, 17, etc.) that the Jew is most conscious, when he hears the name of Nehemiah mentioned.

* This is implied in *Num.R. xix*, § 3 (Germ. trs. W. p. 463): "lest intermarriage promote idolatry."

According to some views, even the Messiah himself was to be a proselyte, i.e. a Gentile. I am reminded by Rabbi Rabinowitz of the remarkable eschatological passage in *T.B. Sukkah*,* where the “Four Smiths” of Zech. ii, 3 are interpreted by R. Hana bar Bizna, in the name of Simeon the Saint, as “The Messiah, son of David; the Messiah, son of Joseph; Elijah; the Righteous Priest.” These four “smiths” are to rebuild the Temple, thus Elijah was chosen as a mason, or “smith for stones”, because he built the altar on Carmel (Rashi). The “Righteous Priest” is, according to Rashi, Melchizedek, and the Munich MS. actually has this reading, instead of *Kohen Sedek*. Melchizedek was one of the favourite types of Gentile proselytes. Kohler (*J.E.* viii, 450) holds that Gen. xiv, 19 is the basis for Ps. cx, 4, where Melchizedek is mentioned as the type of the true king who unites royal and priestly dignity. Like the Messiah, he pre-existed and he is eternal (Heb. vii, 2, 3). According to *Midr. Ps. xxxvii* (f. 126 b, Germ. trs. *W.* p. 271), Abraham learnt from him the practice of charity. So Melchizedek, the Gentile, comes fourth and last of all, the summit of the eschatological ladder. Then the passage in *Sukkah* continues with the “Seven Shepherds” and the “Eight Principal Men” of Micah v, 5. The “Seven Shepherds” have David in the centre. On his right are three Gentiles: Adam, Seth, Methuselah. On his left are three Israelites: Abraham, Jacob, Moses. The “Eight Principal Men” are Jesse, Saul, Samuel, Amos, Zephaniah, Zedekiah, the Messiah and Elijah, a curious list which Rashi cannot explain.

One is instinctively reminded of the “Nine Worthies”:

* 52 b (Germ. trs. *G.* iii, 149).

on this subject see Abrahams' article in the Israel Lewy *Festschrift* (Breslau, 1911).

This does not mean that Rabbinic literature is free from particularisms.

But it is pleasant to note many instances of universalistic tendency. Certain isolated sentences attained, as time went on, to a greater importance than might be imagined. Among such well-known utterances are "The righteous among the Gentiles are priests of God.* The saints of all nations have a share in the world to come."⁴⁰ "He who repudiates idolatry is called a Jew":⁴¹ "A non-Jew who busies himself in the Torah is equal to the High Priest":⁴² "Gentiles outside Palestine are not idolaters; they are but following the customs of their fathers":⁴³ "The poor of the Gentiles, their sick and their dead must be relieved, healed and buried just as though they were Jews, for the sake of peace."⁴⁴ Naturally, social intercourse with Gentiles was governed by such circumstances as persecution or the standard of morality prevailing, which varied in time and place. This would explain the different

* *T. de B.E. Zufa*, ed. Lublin, 1897, end of chapter xx. The passage is not in the Venice edition nor in Friedmann's. The same idea is to be found in a comment on Ps. cxxxii, 16, "Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness." This is interpreted of righteous Gentiles, such as Antoninus, who are God's priests; see *Yalkut*, on Isa. xxvi, 2, § 429 end (cited in vol. i, p. 118).

This verse in Isaiah is similarly used in *T.B. Sab.* 119b (Germ. trs. G. 1, 608) in a universalistic sense. "Whoever it be that answers 'Amen'... his decree (for punishment) is rent (by God)": R. Yohanan adds, that even if such a man has a (slight) taint (*Shemes*, Job iv, 12 = whisper, but in allusion to *Shinsah*, Exod. xxxii, 25, referring to the filth, *Shem So'ah*, of idolatry), God pardons him.

See also the passages cited in vol. i, p. 114, and, for later times, p. 212 below.

attitudes which the Mishnah and *Tosefta* of 'Abhodhah Zarah display. Thus, the Mishnah⁴⁵ deprecates social intercourse. Yet R. Dosetai of Kokaba, a contemporary of R. Me'ir, participated in a feast given by a Gentile and even played a practical joke, which might, to present-day manners, seem of doubtful taste.⁴⁶ The *Tosefta* speaks of greetings and gifts to Gentiles, and of commercial and agricultural partnerships.⁴⁷ Such intercourse tended to promote the spirit of universalism. Nor was universalism checked by love for Palestine. To-day patriotism and support for Geneva go hand-in-hand, and a man is no enemy to another's country because he loves his own. In the same way, the Jews' love for Palestine was combined with deep attachment to Babylonia, their older, ancestral home.⁴⁸ Palestine was a nucleus of Judaism, spread over the Diaspora. But the very purpose of the Diaspora, declared the Pharisees, was to gain proselytes,*⁴⁹ and to win one they compassed land and sea.⁵⁰ The Synagogue was open to all, and just because any worshipper might lead in prayer, test-benedictions were needed to prevent heretical doctrines from being proclaimed from its pulpit.† Full membership involved

* For what was asked of a proselyte and what was the minimum of conformity demanded, see A. Büchler, *Studies in Sin...*, London, 1928, pp. 94 sqq.; see passages quoted in footnotes 2 and 3 on p. 96. Notice that "commands" rather than beliefs are discussed, but the rejection of idolatry (כופר בעבודה זרה של) tacitly implies acceptance of the beliefs of Judaism.

† These formulas would be inoffensive to the ordinary worshipper but a schismatic would refuse to utter them and would, in consequence, not be granted permission to lead in prayer. If one can envisage a service conducted on the lines of the Society of Friends, where anyone present can speak, one can picture what took place in the primitive Synagogue. Thus, the formula on *P.B.S.* p. 45

circumcision and acceptance of the Torah, but there were many who frequented the Synagogue without undertaking the complete obligations of the Jew.* This bare sentence is inserted only to call attention to this highly important aspect of Pharisaism: its adequate treatment would demand more than a lecture to itself and no more can now be said. It is bound to

enunciates the belief in the future life, and this would prevent a Sadducee from officiating without conforming. Similarly, the blessing for Jerusalem (p. 49) was intended to check Samaritans and the denunciation of slanderers on p. 48 was, for a short period, about the time of Paul, directed against the Jewish Christians. The contemporary wording should be studied in Finkelstein's *Studies of the Amidah* in *J.Q.R.* (N.S.), xvi, 1, for 1925. Abrahams (*P.B.A.* p. LXIV) makes it clear that this was not an imprecation against Christians in general, but against antinomian Jews, within the Synagogue. This seems to have been in Justin Martyr's mind when he wrote (xvi, 4) of Jews "cursing in your synagogues them that believe on Christ". On this see Dr Lukyn Williams's excellent note, on p. 33 of his edition of Justin (S.P.C.K. 1930), where a mass of valuable material is collected.

* E.g. the "seven commands of the Sons of Noah", see *J.E.* s.v. "Laws, Noachian". See also *ib.* s.v. "Proselyte". For Antoninus, as a *Ger Sedeck*, see *J.E.* 1, 657; see also vol. 1, p. 119. For *Ger Toshabh* there are many references, e.g. *T.B. Bab. Kam.* 113b (Germ. trs. G. vi, 423), *T.B. 'Ab. Zar.* 65a (Germ. trs. G. vii, 1013).

Significant is the comment of Midrash *Lekah Tobh* (f. 93b, on Exod. xxvii, 20) on Cant. i, 3, "therefore the maidens ('alamoth) love Thee". "Even the Gentiles who are secluded ('alumim) from *miswoth* love Thee, saying 'Holy is the Lord our God'."

A proselyte, in his prayers, may use the phrase "God of our fathers" (*T.J. Bikk.* 1, § 4, f. 64a, l. 16 (French trs. S. iii, 362 foot)). See p. 56, note 42, below.

For many passages about proselytes see Montefiore and Loewe's forthcoming *Rabbinic Anthology*, index, s.v. Proselytes.

For the question whether circumcision was essential for a proselyte and whether it could be postponed, see *T.B. Yeb.* 46a (Germ. trs. G. iv, 156), *T.B. 'Ab. Zar.* 65a (Germ. trs. G. vii, 1013), *T.J. Yeb.* viii, § 1, f. 8d, l. 28 (French trs. S. vii, 111 foot). See also p. 42*.

come up later. See the extract from the *Talkut*, cited on p. 57, *Addenda*.

The Synagogue, already mentioned, was the creation of the Pharisees; Ps. LXXIV, 8, generally ascribed to the Maccabaean age, deplores the burning of all the *Mo'adhe 'El*, the Assemblies of God in the land. For the Pharisees strove to make religion general and to weld the Synagogue to the Temple. The ecclesiastical system was of divine origin but it needed supplementing.* So well did the Pharisees accomplish their task, that when the Temple fell, the Synagogue was firmly established: the shock was barely perceptible, conditions adjusted themselves easily. Certain Temple rites were carried over, others were modified, some were dropped. Sacrifice was over. But its memory was preserved by historical reading. The Synagogue had grown out of the Temple and the services corresponded to the offerings. So the Temple days were not suffered to be forgotten, but the prayer of the lips made up for bullocks. Christianity has preserved but radically changed the sacrificial idea. When you enter

* It must not be forgotten that the Rabbis, as did the Prophets and Psalmists, regarded sacrifices as subordinate to prayer. The following passage is in no way exceptional:

"God said to Israel: 'Be steadfast (*Zehirin*) in prayer, for no quality (*Middah*) is fairer than prayer, it is greater than all the sacrifices' (Isa. i, 11-15): yet this passage ends, 'yea, though ye multiply prayer, I will not hearken, for your hands are full of blood': hence prayer which comes last in the list, is superior to sacrifice. And even if a man be unworthy that his prayer should be answered and that loving-kindness be wrought for him, yet, if he pray and supplicate much, I will, nevertheless, grant him lovingkindness, as it says 'All the ways of the Lord are loving-kindness and truth' (Ps. xxv, 10). I have put lovingkindness before truth and righteousness before justice, for 'righteousness and justice are the foundation of His throne' (Ps. LXXXIX, 15)." (*Tanh.*, vay-Yera, § 1, f. 31b (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 110).)

a Synagogue, the first thing that you see is a lamp burning before the Ark of the Torah. The first sight that strikes your eye in a Church is the Cross and the Altar, symbols of sacrifice. And just as the celebration of the Eucharist in the Church of England, in its more ordinary and traditional Anglican form, reminds a Jew, in certain aspects, of the modern Synagogue and *Kiddush*, so, his impressions of the Roman Catholic Mass will carry his mind back to the Temple ritual and the Sacrifices.

The main purpose of the Pharisaic brotherhoods was the promotion of social service* and the stimulation of public and private worship.† The Synagogue was the centre of much communal activity: it was called the *Beth 'Am*, house of the people, and the fact that we read that this title was sometimes deprecated⁵¹ indicates that occasionally social needs impinged too far on the strictly devotional side. But usually each phase was kept in proper equipoise. Attached to the Synagogue was a hostel.‡ From the Synagogue went forth the collectors of the *Tamhui*,⁵² or dish, which gave relief in kind, that is to say, food, and of the *Kuppah shel sedakah*⁵³ or poor box. Self-respect was inculcated: he who had a week's food was encouraged not to seek charity.⁵⁴ It is well known that in the

* E.g. such purposes as are specified on p. 5 of *P.B.S.*

† The "Men of the Great Synagogue" (see vol. i, p. 110) are said to have restored the ancient formulas of prayer. See Midr. Ps. xix, 1, f. 82a (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 171); *T.J. Ber.* vii, mish. 4, f. 11c, l. 31 (Eng. trs. *S.* p. 134); *T.B. Ber.* 33b (Eng. trs. *C.* p. 226); *T.B. Meg.* 25a (Germ. trs. *G.* iii, 638).

‡ See S. Klein's exhaustive and well-documented articles in *M.G.W.J.* LXXVI, 545–57, 1932, 603 ff., 1933, LXXVII, 81–4. According to *J.E.* vi, 479, the Hostel served also as a hospital for the sick. See also below, p. 245.

Temple there was a "Chamber of the secret ones", *Lishkath H^ashā'im*, where donors and recipients of alms never saw each other. But this provision for the *B^enē Tobhim*, whom we may call "decent folk", was copied in other cities.⁵⁵ It is interesting to observe that in Amsterdam the Communal Charity Board sits at night, in a building approached by an unlit lane. The Synagogue was the home of religious instruction, where sermons were delivered as well as in the House of Study, often mentioned in connexion with the Synagogue. Of the literary activity of the school, nothing need now be said, either of the teaching and preaching tours conducted by its leaders and agents, or of the books which contain the record of their teaching.

Mention must be made of the '*Am ha-'ares*'. This term does not denote the bulk of the people, nor does it refer to pious simple folk.* We read that the '*Am ha-'ares*

* The alleged antagonism between "the Wise" and the '*Am ha-'ares*' must neither be minimised nor exaggerated. In *T.B. Sanh.* 99b (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 436), the man who mocks at the wise is an Epicurean, not one of the '*Am ha-'ares*'. In *Aboth* ii, 15 (Eng. trs. *P.B.S.* p. 189), Eliezer b. Hyrcanus warned his disciples against the "bites", "stings" and "hisses" of the Wise. Yet, in the same breath, he bade his disciples attend the lectures of the Wise. Moreover, Eliezer, himself of the Wise, was of no gentle disposition and he was excommunicated. Again, in *Num.R.* iii, § 1, *init.* (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 35), where the "stings" etc. are mentioned, the '*Am ha-'ares*' are declared to be an essential component in Israel. Cf. the parable of the "Four species and sinners" in *Lev.R.*, 'Emor, xxx, 12 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 214), also *Pes.K.* 185a (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 269); the similar parable of the frankincense and sinners, in *T.B. Ker.* 6b (Germ. trs. *G.* ix, 484). 'Akiba's bitter reminiscence of his unregenerate days (*T.B. Pes.* 49b (Germ. trs. *G.* ii, 494)) and the other, bitter remarks on that page must not be given undue weight: they are hyperbolical. When we read (ib.) "Greater is the hatred of the

often was the man who gambled, whose word was untrustworthy and whose sensual appetite was unbridled. He evaded his dues.⁵⁶ The taxes of the government were collected by the publicans: these could not be evaded. But the whole religious charitable system stood and fell by the conscientious payment of tithes and other imposts. The Pharisees strove to arouse a sense of national honour. The proper maintenance of religion was bound to suffer if men neglected or repudiated their moral dues. [The Pharisees strove to make everyone scrupulous: they put no burdens on others which they themselves refused to shoulder]*

'*Amme ha'-ares* towards the Wise than is that of the idolators towards Israelites: the hatred borne by their wives is more vehement than their own", we must remember examples—of which there are not a few—on the other side. Josephus tells us that the Pharisees were popular and possessed authority and that the people sided with them (*Ant.* XIII, ch. x, 5, § 288; ib. 6, § 298). "Authority" here suggests Rabbis and not laymen. The *Baraita* which ends the discussion in *Pes.* (*loc. cit. supra*) is more sober, and also more natural in character, than the individual marks that precede it and which do not carry the same conviction as it bears. See Targ. to *Cant.* iv, 1.

And on the other side, the feelings of the Wise towards the '*Am ha'-ares*' also show, upon occasion, love and not hatred. These two voices are just what one would expect; for they indicate a desire to win the '*Am ha'-ares*', to raise his moral and intellectual standard but to condemn, with outspoken earnestness, the shortcomings to which he was prone. Thus, "Take care of the children of the '*Am ha'-ares*', for from them shall Torah come forth" (*T.B. Sanh.* 96a (Germ. trs. G. vii, 414 foot)); "Do not say, 'love the scholars but hate the '*Am ha'-ares*'; love them all" (*A.R.N.*, vers. I, xvi, f. 32b foot); "The Lord will annul every misfortune decreed for a man, if he teaches the son of an '*Am ha'-ares*'" (*T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 85a (Germ. trs. G. vi, 777)). See also *H.L.* p. 499.

* Cf. "No decree may be imposed on the Community which is intolerable to the majority", *T.B. Bab. Bat.* 60b (Germ. trs. G. vi, 1102): see below, p. 302*.

Indeed, in many respects they lightened the obligations rather than increased them.

[Social service took many forms—visiting the sick, redeeming the captives, burying the dead, educating the young, above all popular preaching; all these objects were the aim of the *Haburoth*, or brotherhoods. The preachers were often humble craftsmen, like the followers of Wesley.⁵⁷ The *Haburoth* were open to all. They were not removed from the world but very much in it and of it. The development of these groups—we may almost use the modern word and think of the Oxford “groups”—shows in some features a certain similarity to monasticism, but two great differences are noteworthy. The *Haburoth*, as stated, were not eremites and they were not ascetic. If John’s followers kept more than the scriptural fasts, the Pharisees did not imitate them. He who observes such extra fasts is impeding the work of heaven, they said.* The characteristic of the *Haburoth* was joy,† in many phases of their religion this is strikingly discernible. They gave the festivals a new lease of life by adding motives from history to the ancient nature feasts.‡ They succeeded in mitigating the severity of the old penal laws.§ They

* According to *T.B. Ta'an.* 11a (Eng. trs. *M.* p. 77), he is called even a sinner.

† On this joy in religion, *Simhah shel miswah*, see vol. I, pp. 138–40, and see below, p. 175.

‡ Thus, for example, Pentecost became the feast of the giving of the Law. The double nature of the festival is mentioned in *Jub.* vi, 21. On the whole question see Ch. Albeck, *Buch d. Jub. und die Hal.* (*Beilage z. Jahresber. d. Hochschule f. d. Wiss. d. Jud.*, Berlin, 1930) p. 16. See also *S.J.W.* p. 42.

§ Thus, the *Lex talionis* was commuted to compensation, see *T.B. Bab.K.* 83b (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 301): also *ib.* 84a (*G.* vi, 303). See also *Sifra* (on *Lev.* xxiv, 20), xx, § 7 (ed. Weiss, f. 104d).

insisted on kind treatment of animals.⁵⁸ A man must feed his beast before himself,⁵⁹ and the ritual slaughter of animals for food was rigidly circumscribed by law to make death humane and, as far as possible, painless.⁶⁰ After(?) the destruction of the Temple a system of elementary education was instituted throughout the land.⁶¹ Children were cared for. Family life was seen to be on a high level. Above all, charity and alms-giving were practised on a large scale: the recipient's self-respect must not be impaired.⁶² Greater is one who lends than one who gives.⁶³

The position of women was also remarkable:^{*} mono-

In *Megillath Ta'anith*, iv, it is stated that mourning was forbidden on Tammuz 4 (or 14) because "the book of decrees was removed". This is usually explained as the supersession of the sterner Sadducean code by the milder Pharisaic ordinances. But Sol. Zeitlin (*Meg. Ta'anith*, Philadelphia, 1922, p. 83) maintains that the holiday was instituted because of the concessions which Alexander Balas and Demetrius granted, whereby the decrees of the Greeks were annulled (I Macc. x). The question is, however, far from settled. It is admirably discussed by Hans Lichtenstein in "Die Fastenrolle", *H.U.C.A.* VIII-IX, 296. See vol. I, p. 146.

For *Lex talionis* in Islam, see below, p. 179.

* The well-known adage *Betho zu 'Ishto*, "A man's wife is his home" (*Yoma* i, 1 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 162)) shows the central position occupied by the wife and her prominence in social life and social work. Her charity is more "direct" than her husband's (see the stories of the charity of Mar Ukba's wife, *T.B. Keth.* 67b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 680); of Barbohin, *Esther R.* ii, 3 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 18); of Hanina's wife, *T.B. Keth.* 68a (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 681)). In *T.B. Ta'an.* 24b and 25a (Eng. trs. *M.* p. 187), other stories of her are narrated. R. Yoše said: "Never in my life have I called my wife 'wife', always 'my home'." (This was a term of endearment and a tribute to her competence, *T.B. Gitt.* 52a (Germ. trs. *G.* v, 529).) The positive precepts, fulfilled at a definite time, and from which women are exempt, are enumerated in *T.J. Kidd.* i, § 8, f. 61c, line 11 (French trs. *S.* ix, p. 233).

A man loves his wife and honours her more than himself (*T.B. Sanh.* 76b (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 325); *T.B. Yeb.* 62b (Germ. trs.

gamy was the general rule,* although it was not legally enforced until long after the Pharisaic age, in Rabbenu Gershom's day, in the year 1000. The wife was protected by the *Kethubbah* or marriage covenant. It is said that the separate examination of the wife in England, in Final Concords, is due to the acquaintance with Jewish Law produced through the Exchequer of the Jews. The writ of *Elegit* is another instance of the influence of Jewish Law at the same time.⁶⁴ With regard to divorce, as is well known, there was a great difference of opinion between the schools of Hillel and Shammai.⁶⁵ The difference of outlook has persisted through the ages.

Slavery as an institution was challenged neither by the Pharisees nor by Jesus. But it was not the slavery of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Not only was the '*Ebed* rather an indentured or apprenticed labourer, to be treated with kindness and consideration, but the Pharisees

(*G.* iv, 219 foot)). The wife dies with the husband, he with her (*T.B. Sanh.* 22b top (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 85)). A man should take counsel with his wife, the proverb says "If thy wife be small [lit. a dwarf, *Guṣa*], bend down to her ear and whisper" (*T.B. Bab. Mes.* 59a (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 677)). God counts her tears (ib.). God dwells in a worthy home, i.e. where there is love and purity (*T.B. Sot.* 17a (Germ. trs. *G.* v, 230)). It is only through a man's wife that blessing reigns in a man's house (*T.B. Bab. Mes.* 59a foot (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 678)). See also the remarks of R. Tanhum in the name of R. Hanilai. "He who has no wife lives without joy, blessing or good" (*T.B. Yeb.* 62b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 219)).

* It must, however, be mentioned that while polygamy is sometimes regarded as conceivable (cf. *Lev.R.* iv, § 5; Germ. trs. *W.* p. 28), the marriage of a woman to two husbands is not conceivable (*Tanna de Be Eliyyahu*, ed. Friedmann, p. 43, parallels in note). Yet this remark may well be no more than a deduction from the past. For in the Bible, polygamy occurs among the Patriarchs, etc., while polyandry—or even dyandry—does not.

insisted that he must not lose his *caput*.* As against the Sadducees, they preserved his personality as an individual. He shades off, into the labourer, whose rights were safeguarded as zealously as by a Trades Union, though justice to the employer was not impugned, and into the metayer,† who paid rent for his land in kind. The agricultural and the land laws are full of interest and could well be compared and contrasted with the feudal system.

But this emphasis on personality was by no means limited to slaves nor was it confined to Jews. It was the inalienable right of every human being. When Moses asked God to appoint his successor, he addressed Him as "Lord God of the Spirits of all flesh".⁶⁶ On this the Midrash⁶⁷ has a section which is well worth study. The phrase "Spirits" is stressed to show that no two people act and think alike. Just as their faces

* *Yadayim* IV, 7 (Eng. trs. D. p. 784).

The relation of labourer to employer may be judged by such passages as *Jer. Dem.* VII, § 4, 26b, l. 24 (French trs. S. II, 212), where it is stated that a hired labourer must not starve (*siggef*) himself unduly because he lessens his power to work for his employer. In *T.B. Ta'an.* 22b (Eng. trs. M. p. 164) the same is said of any individual, lest he become dependent upon charity.

On respect for human life see *H.L.* p. 490. Montefiore points out that "Torture, so familiar to cultivated Greeks, was unknown to Hebrew law. There is no example or instance of infanticide. In respect for old age, decrepitude and helplessness, the Jewish religion from the post-exilic periods onwards has yielded to none" (see vol. I, p. 147).

It should, however, be remarked that cultured Greeks were tending to humanitarianism very strongly from 300 B.C. onwards. By the beginning of the Christian era, most Greeks would have viewed it with abhorrence; the outrageous cruelty of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was a Seleucid and not a representative Greek, was not typical of Hellas.

† An excellent book on this subject is *A.L.*

differ so do their minds. God creates crowds of human beings and recognizes their separate personalities. Each man has a right to be understood, and the true successor to Moses is one who will be sympathetic to every single person in his charge.

[The Pharisees did not hesitate to adapt the law to changed conditions: they employed the principle of the legal fiction,⁶⁸ in order to safeguard principles while relaxing hard conditions.] Blackstone styles the legal fiction as one of the foundations of jurisprudence.* The best instance of this method is furnished by the Prosbul,⁶⁹ by which Hillel made a system of commercial credit possible and thus enabled legitimate business to develop and a primitive community to adapt itself to economic change. Here, on the question of interest, a great deal remains to be said: a great problem of the Middle Ages was created by the interpretation of Luke vi, 35, and the resultant divergence from the Pharisaic attitude.† This matter is bound to attract the consideration of subsequent lecturers.

This course owed its inception primarily to two remarkable sermons, delivered on two successive days; the one, in the Cambridge Synagogue‡ on a Saturday, the other, in a College Chapel§ on the following Sunday. It may have been a coincidence that both preachers chose a similar theme, it may have been an indication that the subject was one that was engaging the attention of two religions. The discourse of the visiting Rabbi was designed to show that human progress is spasmodic

* See p. 308*.

† I have dealt with this question on pp. cii ff. of my *Excursus on usury*, in *S.C.B.M.* ‡ By Rabbi Rabinowitz.

§ 'Queens', by the Rev. G. Jessop.

and irregular, but that in spite of occasional retrogressions mankind is improving. The College Chaplain dwelt upon Hope, the second of the Christian triad of virtues and the one which, he said, was most frequently disregarded to-day. In itself, the similarity of subject may not have been of great importance. One might remark that not many years ago such pleas would possibly have been considered trite and otiose. But the reaction to the sermons, as typified by subsequent discussions among the members of both congregations, was both novel and remarkable. It was clear that the preacher's case, whether in Synagogue or in Chapel, was by no means uncontested. Not agnostics but deeply religious people were inclined to challenge the view that ideas and ideals must, in the long run, dominate brute force or chance. It was not "eat and drink for to-morrow we die", but "even though we must die to-morrow, let us live virtuously to-day, if hopelessly". That those who believed in the divine government of the world should feel uncertain about the destinies of the future was significant. It was asserted by several participants in the discussion that the validity of religion stood apart from the question whether we were or were not better, morally or materially, than our fathers. It was regarded as Eudaimonism to make the acceptance of God depend on the amelioration of man's affairs; to do this was to do what Antigonus of Sokho long ago declared to be wrong, namely, to serve God for the hope of a reward. With the truth or falsity of this contention we are not now concerned: its examination devolves on theologians. The basis of the contention is that, if tested periodically through the course of the ages, it will not

be found that ideas develop for good: the opposition offered by material factors is too strong and the good succumbs to evil, or, at best, survives by chance. Is this true? The answer need not involve a comprehensive survey of civilization, from the time of the Stone Age: such a survey is impossibly wide. Since the debate centred round those ideas which lie at the basis of Christianity and Judaism it is possible to limit the field. We seek not to prove a presupposed thesis but to examine facts: we will leave to the historians the task of drawing conclusions. We will be purely objective. Let us trace these ideas, the heritage of the Prophets, the Psalmists and the Law-giver, and see where they lead and what they meet on the way. When they developed and came into contact with other schools of thought, what was the result? In the foregoing pages a few heads of subjects have been outlined and no more than outlined; the contacts with Hellenism, Rome, Europe, Islam, the Renaissance and the Reformation will be traced in the succeeding lectures.

Here an objection may very possibly be raised, and it is best formulated and best answered by Sir R. W. Livingstone:⁷⁰

"There are two ways of studying a civilization. It may be summoned to an amateur Last Judgement, its virtues and vices exhaustively recounted, the balance struck between good and bad, and an honest verdict pronounced. The method is legitimate, but the work requires superhuman knowledge and rare impartiality, and perhaps we might apply to it the words in which Plato describes the task of the Higher Critic as 'the occupation of a very clever and laborious and rather unfortunate man'. Further, it may be misleading as well as

unprofitable to catalogue elaborately the vices of a people. A complete estimate of England would include Cromwell, Chatham, Burke, Wesley, Wilberforce, but also Bute, George IV, and Northcliffe; *The Times*, but also less admirable journalism; the town-building of the nineteenth century and the ribbon development of the twentieth; the slums, the prisons before Howard, the penal laws of the eighteenth century, the abuses of the enclosures, the cruelties and injustices of the Industrial Revolution; the 'dogs' and the films; the Liberator frauds and the Hatry scandal; the aspects of social and financial life which occasionally see light in the law courts. Long before the catalogue was ended, we might wonder whether this was the way to know England. Such a procedure is no more illuminating in the case of Greece.

"A civilization may be studied, less ambitiously but not unprofitably, in a different way. We may estimate its significance to the world and its permanent contribution to history and human progress, concentrating on its greatness. That is the method of this book."

That is to be the method of these lectures.

I am confident that the shortcomings of the introduction will be counterbalanced by the success of the succeeding lectures, which are, after all, the *raison d'être* of the course. The competence, not to say the brilliance, of the scholars who are participating in the series makes it certain that this forecast will be justified.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER I

¹ See vol. I, pp. 105 ff.

² See, for example, *Tanh.*, Shemoth, § 2, f. 81b.

³ See note 5, p. 109 in vol. I.

⁴ For the literature and for a detailed discussion, see *Jud.* III,
7-II.

⁵ See *T.B. Hullin*, f. 134b (Germ. trs. G. viii, 1243).

- ⁶ See *Eccles.R.* on ix, 9 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 123).
- ⁷ See note 2 on p. 108 of vol. I. ⁸ *J.C.A.* p. 5.
- ⁹ See *Encyc. Judaica*, vol. I, s.v.
- ¹⁰ II Chron. XIII, 22 and XXIV, 27.
- ¹¹ *Gen.R.* I, § 14 (ed. Theodor, p. 12; Germ. trs. *W.* p. 6).
- ¹² See below, pp. 200 and 274 foot. ¹³ *J.C.A.* p. 39.
- ¹⁴ See Mishnah *Meg.* IV, § 10 and J. Rabbinowitz's note on p. 135 of his Eng. trs. (*R.*).
- ¹⁵ See above, p. 12[†], p. 92[†] and vol. I, p. 135, note 2.
- ¹⁶ *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*, Oxford, 1935, p. 56.
- ¹⁷ v, 9 (*P.B.S.* p. 200).
- ¹⁸ *T.B. Pes.* 64b (Germ. trs. *G.* II, 549).
- ¹⁹ *T.B. Ned.* 41a (Germ. trs. *G.* IV, 921 foot).
- ²⁰ *T.B. Nid.* 31a (Germ. trs. *W.* IX, 808).
- ²¹ See Abrahams' note in *P.B.A.* p. ccv foot.
- ²² Ib. p. 274 foot.
- ²³ For the whole story, see *T.B. Ta'an.* 19a (Eng. trs. *M.* p. 135). ²⁴ v, 8 (*P.B.S.* p. 200, line 2).
- ²⁵ *Gen.R.* IV, § 4 (ed. Theodor, p. 27; Germ. trs. *W.* p. 15).
- ²⁶ Ib.
- ²⁷ On this see vol. I, pp. 141 ff. ²⁸ Ib.
- ²⁹ Eng. trs. *D.* p. 397.
- ³⁰ For pre-existence in Islam, see *Encycl. of Islam*.
- ³¹ Germ. trs. *G.* II, 512. ³² See below, p. 78.
- ³³ See Travers Herford's trs. (1st ed. New York, 1925), p. 23.
- ³⁴ E.g. *T.B. Kid.* 40b, top (Germ. trs. *G.* V, 835).
- ³⁵ On this, see C. G. Montefiore's *Synoptic Gospels*, II, 326.
- ³⁶ Travers Herford deals with this in the Introduction to his *Talmud and Apocrypha*, London, 1933; also ib. p. 182.
- ³⁷ See *P.B.S.* pp. 37 ff. and *P.B.A.* pp. XLIII ff.
- ³⁸ *P.B.A.* pp. XLVII and LX.
- ³⁹ *T.B. Sot.* 5a (Germ. trs. *G.* V, 177).
- ⁴⁰ *Tos. Sanh.* XIII, 2 (ed. Z. p. 434).
- ⁴¹ *T.B. Meg.* 13a (Germ. trs. *G.* III, 582; *G.* has "Judæan" for "Jew").
- ⁴² *T.B. Bab. K.* 38a (Germ. trs. *G.* VI, 137). See also *Sifra* on Lev. XVIII, 5, ed. Weiss, f. 86 b, § 13.
- ⁴³ *T.B. Hullin* 13b (Germ. trs. *G.* VIII, 839).
- ⁴⁴ *T.B. Gittin* 61a (Germ. trs. *G.* V, 569).
- ⁴⁵ I, 3 (Eng. trs. *E.* p. 5).
- ⁴⁶ *Num.R.* XXI, § 20 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 519); on Dosetai and his action, see *J.E.* s.v.
- ⁴⁷ See I, § 3 (Z. p. 460, line 19); III, § 14 (Z. p. 464, line 20); VII (Z. p. 471), etc.

⁴⁸ *Toṣ. B.K.* vii, § 3 (*Z. p.* 357, line 30). On this see vol. i, p. 151.

⁴⁹ *T.B. Peṣ.* 87b (Germ. trs. *G.* ii, 640).

⁵⁰ *Matt.* xxiii, 15.

⁵¹ *T.B. Sab.* 32a (Germ. trs. *G.* i, 391).

⁵² *Peah* viii, 7 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 20). ⁵³ Ib. ⁵⁴ Ib.

⁵⁵ *Toṣ. Shek.* ii, § 16 (*Z. p.* 177, line 11).

⁵⁶ See Abrahams' essay at the end of vol. ii of Montefiore's *Synoptic Gospels*, 2nd ed., London, 1927.

⁵⁷ On this see vol. i, p. 123.

⁵⁸ Cf. *T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 85a (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 775).

⁵⁹ *T.B. Ber.* 40a (Eng. trs. *C.* p. 262).

⁶⁰ See the provisions of *Hullin* i, 1, etc. (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 513 and footnote).

⁶¹ *T.B. Bab. Bat.* 21a (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 1003); *T.B. Sab.* 119b (*G.* i, 609 top); *T.B. Kid.* 30a (*G.* v, 795); *T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 85b (*G.* vi, 779); *T.B. Ned.* 81a (*G.* iv, 996). See also the interesting comments in 'Ekhah Zuta, §§ 41, 42, on f. 35b in Buber's 2nd ed. Dr M. Braun kindly draws attention to the following passages in Josephus (*Ap.* i, 12; ii, 17 sqq.; *Ant.* iv, 8, § 12) and in Philo (*Leg. ad C.* § 115 (xvi, 31)).

⁶² *Sifre*, Deut., § 116 (f. 98b); *T.B. Kethubboth* 67b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 678).

⁶³ *T.B. Sab.* 63a (Germ. trs. *G.* i, 466).

⁶⁴ See F. Ashe Lincoln's Essay on the Jews in English Law in *S.C.B.M.* vol. II.

⁶⁵ *Gittin* ix, 10 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 321). See p. 185, *Addenda* to p. 173. ⁶⁶ *Num. xxvii*, 15, 16.

⁶⁷ *Num.R.* xxi, § 2 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 507).

⁶⁸ On this see pp. 308 ff. below. ⁶⁹ Ib.

⁷⁰ *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*, Oxford, 1935, p. 8.

⁷¹ (P. 29*.) *Mekh.²*, *Shiratha*, I (Eng. trs. *L.* ii, 5).

⁷² (P. 39.) *P.B.S.* p. 34.

ADDENDA

P. 9. The plural may denote many copies written by Me'ir, who was a scribe.

P. 13. For *Tabe'al=Ramla* (Remaliah), by *Al-Bam*, in Isa. vii, 6, see ibn Ezra, *in loc.*

P. 44. There is a particularly striking passage about proselytes in the *Yalkut* (§ 459) on Isa. XLIV, 5, "One shall say, I am the Lord's; and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob; and another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord, and surname himself by the name of Israel". The passage continues:

"Beloved are the proselytes, for in every place God gives the same 'surnames' to them as to Israel. Thus, Israel are called 'Ministers', as it says 'As for you, Ministers of the Lord shall ye be called' (Isa. LXI, 6) [note that the citation differs from the M.T.; this may be a genuine variant or a citation from memory]; and so, too, proselytes are called 'Ministers', as it says 'And the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord to "minister" unto Him' (Isa. LVI, 6). Israel are called 'Servants', as it says 'For unto Me are the children of Israel "servants"' (Lev. XXV, 55): and so, too, proselytes are called 'servants', as it says 'To love the Name of the Lord and to be "servants" unto Him' (Isa. LVI, 6). Israel are called 'Lovers' (Prov. VIII, 21) and the proselyte is called the 'Loving proselyte' (Deut. X, 19: note how the Hebrew 'loving the stranger' is, by a bold homiletical inversion, made to mean the opposite!). R. Simeon b. Yohai said: It says 'Let them that love Him be as the Sun' (Judges V, 31). Who is the greater, he who loves the King or he whom the king loves? Surely the latter, hence the interpretation of Deut. X, 19, as above. In regard to Israel the covenant is mentioned (Gen. XVII, 13) and also in regard to proselytes (Isa. LVI, 6). 'Acceptance' is said of Israel (Exod. XXVIII, 38) and of proselytes (Isa. LVI, 7). God is the Guardian of Israel (Ps. CXXI, 4) and of proselytes (Ps. CXLVI, 9). Abraham called himself a proselyte (Gen. XXIII, 4), so did David (I Chron. XXIX, 15; Ps. XXXIX, 13). Beloved are the proselytes, since Abraham was not circumcised until he was ninety-nine years old. For had he been circumcised at the age of twenty or thirty, there would have been none who became proselytes at that age [reading according to the commentary *Shemen Ra'anah*, to the *Talukot*, in loc., citing the tractate *Gerim*]. So God bore with him till he reached ninety-nine years, so as not to close the door in the face of proselytes [so that they could see that circumcision does not debilitate even an old man, Gen. R. XLVI, 2 and *Mattenoth K.* in loc. (Germ. trs. W. p. 215)] and so as to give a reward of longevity and so as to increase the reward of those who do His Will, as it says (Isa. XLII, 21).

Thou wilt find that these four classes (i.e. those mentioned in Isa. XLIV, 5, cited at the beginning) assert and proclaim before Him Who but spake and the world was, as follows: 'One shall say, I am the Lord's,' these are the God-fearers: 'Another shall call himself by the name of Jacob,' he shall say 'No sin is mingled with me': 'Another shall subscribe with his hand unto the Lord,' these are the penitents. 'And surname himself by the name of Israel,' these are the righteous proselytes (reading according to *Shemen Ra'anah*: see the remainder of the note there)."

CHAPTER II
PHARISAISM AND HELLENISM

BY
W. L. KNOX

N O T E

For Rabbinical parallels to the Hellenistic Jewish literature, except in so far as they are to be found in such standard works as G. F. Moore's *Judaism* and Strack-Billerbeck's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, I am indebted to Mr Loewe.

CHAPTER II

PHARISAISM AND HELLENISM

I shall not attempt in this lecture to cover the whole field of Pharisaism in its contact with Hellenism, or to examine the influence of that contact on the text of the Septuagint. My subject will be almost entirely the literature of Hellenistic Judaism of the orthodox Pharisaic type; even about that, I shall have to put forward some rather unorthodox views, which I shall have to ask you to accept without anything like an adequate investigation of the evidence.

Our sources fall into three main classes. The first is that vast and ill-ordered library which goes under the name of Philo of Alexandria; we may couple with his works the first ten chapters of the Book of Wisdom, one of the great masterpieces of the religious literature of the world. The second class of sources professes to deal not directly with religion or the philosophy of religion, but with history, or what professes to be history. But it is almost true to say that for the Judaism of the beginning of our era the distinction between history and philosophy is a distinction of degree, not of kind. All history is a history of God's dealings with man: all true philosophy is an understanding of God in the light of those dealings.* The works of Josephus are primarily historical, but they throw a great deal of

* Cf. the conventional method of expounding a system of doctrine by means of a summary of the history of the Old Testament, in which incidents are selected or emphasized as a proof of the speaker's argument.

light on the religious outlook of Hellenistic Judaism. Josephus, though a Jew of Jerusalem, is a thorough Hellenist in his outlook. To Josephus we may add a large number of fragments, mainly preserved by Eusebius, from Jewish writers of the 150 years before the beginning of our era, when we first find a Jewish literature developing at Alexandria. Our third class are the Christian sources, notably the Pauline Epistles. They must be used with caution; converts seldom do justice to the faith they have left, and we can seldom be quite certain that the beliefs which they express were not formed or accepted after conversion. None the less they are important; especially we must remember that St Paul is the only Pharisee, in the strict sense of the word, whose relations with Hellenism we can study at first-hand; and we can check him to a large extent by what we know of Judaism and Christianity from other sources.

Unquestionably our most important source is Philo. In the first place he is by far the most voluminous. It is usual to hear that Philo was an eccentric Jew who dabbled in philosophy and believed in something called the Logos. He is usually dismissed as a curious but unimportant by-product of the Hellenistic age. One could hardly find a more erroneous view. Philo is not an eccentric philosopher, nor even an eclectic philosopher. He is a compiler. It is usually recognized that he has incorporated a large part of the commentary of Posidonius on the *Timaeus* of Plato. But, unless I am very much mistaken, he has incorporated also large sections of many other writings. As a result we can find in him a whole body of traditional teaching of the schools and synagogues of Alexandria, often in a

digested form, but quite often recognizable. We shall come shortly to a remarkable case in point, his treatment of the divine Wisdom. I can here only express the opinion that a vast amount of work remains to be done on Philo; as an individual he is intensely dull; but as a quarry he yields valuable results. The relative importance of the other sources will appear from the extent to which we use them.

The main scene of the contact of Judaism with Hellenistic thought was Alexandria. The dominant tradition of philosophy here was the later form of Stoicism, a system largely affected by Platonism and Pythagoreanism. Now this school of thought had what we may almost call a bible, or at least a book of Genesis of its own, the *Timaeus* of Plato.* In that dialogue we have a cosmogony which may be that of Plato, based on Pythagoras, or it may be a Pythagorean cosmogony which Plato has preserved. It does not concern us to ask how far it is Plato's own, nor even what is the real meaning of a very difficult and disputed work. What matters is the interpretation of it by the Alexandrine Stoics. According to their interpretation, we have first the one supreme God of the cosmos, whom it is hard to find and impossible to describe. He is perfectly good and He desired therefore to communicate His goodness to others, so He decided to create the universe. He first created a perfect pattern of the material world, which contained in itself the pattern of all things in the universe. From this pattern, which was a living and divine being, He proceeded to

* Cf. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie Grecque*, p. 20. Macrobius, *In Somn. Scip.* II, 5 and 7, "reconciles" Vergil and Cicero with all the enthusiasm and ingenuity of a modern defender of infallibility.

fashion the material universe; this is composed of fire and earth, joined to one another by air and water, the stages through which fire and earth merge into one another. The laws of harmony uniting them are those which find their expression in the seven notes of the musical scale. The heavenly bodies were created as gods by the supreme deity; the living creatures on earth were made by them, and among the living creatures on earth is man, made of partly divine and partly material components, mortal yet also immortal.

The simplest exposition of the main ideas of the *Timaeus* with which I am acquainted is that of F. H. Brabant.* Whether it is an accurate exposition of the meaning of the dialogue I must leave to Platonic scholars. It is certainly an accurate exposition of the way in which it was interpreted by Philo and accommodated by him to Jewish thought, and so passed into Christian theology. It is to be presumed that it represents the interpretation of Posidonius, the main source of that blend of Platonism, Pythagoreanism and Stoicism which dominates Philo and the Greek Fathers. In the later Stoics the divine pattern becomes the divine element of reason, which is also fire in its most refined and ethereal form. This element as a whole is concentrated in the firmament of heaven, but also pervades the whole universe. Man, the microcosm, corresponds precisely to the universe, the macrocosm. In him the divine element of fire or reason is concentrated in the heart, which the dominant Stoic view regarded as the seat of reason, yet it also pervades the whole body; the reason apprehends what the senses

* *Time and Eternity in Christian Thought* (Bampton Lectures for 1936), pp. 10-21.

feel, only because it is diffused throughout the whole body. Thus we have a strict parallelism between man and the universe, since there is in both a concentration of the divine element in the dominant part,* yet at the same time it is diffused everywhere. According to the *Timaeus* there should be beyond all this a transcendent creator; but the Stoics vary. Sometimes they seem to have had simply a divine reason pervading the whole; sometimes they seem to have followed the *Timaeus* more closely and to have retained a transcendent deity, a divine principle which was equated to the firmament, as well as the divine pattern of the universe, which is the reason pervading the universe. That is why in Philo the Logos is sometimes the divine pattern of the cosmos, and seems to have an independent existence of its own, while sometimes it appears to be simply the immanent divine reason which pervades it. I doubt whether the Stoics of the time had a consistent system: Philo certainly has nothing of the kind. What the Stoics cared for was a philosophy which should retain the older Stoic belief in God as the immanent reason of the universe, but at the same time allow that measure of transcendence which is necessary, if we are to think of God as a being whom we can worship. The fact that they regarded God as composed of an infinitely ethereal fire and therefore in the last resort material, must not mislead us. They seem to have been driven to this view by the argument of the later Academics, that you cannot conceive of anything which is purely spiritual. The Stoics failed to see that the answer is that you can conceive it; you cannot imagine it, in the sense that

* The ἡγεμονικόν.

you cannot form a mental picture of it, but you can conceive of it as possibly existing. In any case, the concession did not interfere with the spirituality of their view of the universe.

Such in outline was the Stoic cosmogony. In theory it was monotheistic; in practice, it might or might not be. If God is immanent in all things, you can worship anything, on the ground that you are worshipping not it, but God present in it. So you could worship the planets or the forces of nature, while by the aid of allegory any myth could be interpreted as a vehicle of divine truth, and the cult which was based on it could claim the adherence of a reasonable man. On the other hand Stoicism was intensely ethical. Man was a divine soul in a material body; he must live up to his true nature, the divine element of reason in him. The four great virtues, prudence, courage, justice and temperance, must be the ruling principles of his life. Stoicism was entirely concerned with righteousness.

This was the philosophy of Alexandria. Judaism found it entirely congenial. The Greek might boast that Plato had taught that God is one: Moses had taught it long before, and probably Plato had borrowed it. Judaism too had its doctrine of a divine element which was God's agent in creation, His purpose for the world and the power by which He ruled it, in the form of the divine Wisdom. The figure of the divine Wisdom, as it meets us in Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, is the great mystery of post-exilic Judaism. Here I must be dogmatic and be content to state that there is absolutely no reason to suppose that the figure of Wisdom in these two books represents any Greek influence on Judaism. I am pretty confident that even in Proverbs,

as certainly in *Ecclesiasticus*, Wisdom is a personification of the Torah, and that it is in its origin a deliberate substitution for the great Egyptian goddess Isis, modified in *Ecclesiasticus* by features taken from Astarte; the two great goddesses Astarte and Isis had been identified from time immemorial.¹ The adoption was an attempt to counteract the ever-present danger that Judaism would revert to its old habit of adding the "Queen of Heaven" to the Pantheon; it substituted for her the semi-personified Torah as an object not of worship but of reverence and affection. It is possible that the personification represents an unconscious psychological "compensation", but I think it is a deliberate and very successful expedient for safeguarding monotheism.* At the same time it asserts the valuable truth that God is bound by His own law; for the Torah is not an arbitrary code of laws, but an expression of the divine nature.

Anyhow Judaism could claim not merely that Moses had known that God is one long before Plato, but also that the divine pattern of the universe, which is also the divine power immanent in it, had been known to the great King Solomon when he wrote the book of Proverbs. The effect of contact with Greek thought on the figure of Wisdom was twofold. Wisdom became less obviously the personification of the Torah and became far more the divine power immanent in the cosmos, the rational element in man and the ruling power in the life of the wise man. In other words, it becomes the infused divine principle of Stoic cosmogony; and if you read the portrait of the wise man who

* I hope to defend this view fully in an article to be published in the near future in the *Journal of Theological Studies*: the evidence on which it rests demands a treatment which would be impossible here.

speaks in the person of Solomon in Wisdom vii, 17, you will see that he is not really the wise king of Israel, but the philosopher of Greece, who aspires to omniscience; there is a distinct suggestion of Posidonius, the last representative of this ideal of Greek philosophy. At the same time the figure of Wisdom became far less concrete; you can hardly say that the Wisdom of the book of Wisdom is a really personal figure at all. You could not worship her as she stands, merely by changing the label, as you could worship the Wisdom of Proverbs. It is interesting that the Roman Catholic Church takes the lessons for feasts of the Virgin Mary from Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus: the book of Wisdom provides them for occasions which are concerned with the pre-existing Logos or the Holy Spirit.

Philo goes a step farther and substitutes for Wisdom the masculine term Logos. Now the Logos in Philo can be the divine pattern of which the material world is a copy, the divine power immanent in the cosmos, the divine agent in creation, or the divine purpose in creation, or the Platonic idea of the good. In fact he can be anything that appears in Plato or the Stoics as the power of God acting on the world, or as an intermediary between God and the world, or as the reason of God immanent in the world. Thus the Logos can, at times, be almost an independent personal being, for the divine pattern of the *Timaeus* is itself living and divine: hence Philo can say that it was to the Logos that God said, "Let us* make man in our own image and

* [Compare the discussion on "us", in *Gen.R.* viii, § 3, Th. 58 (Germ. trs. W. p. 31). The question of "responsibility (p. 69)" also occurs there. The principles underlying the Targumic versions and their treatment of such anthropomorphisms also need consideration: see above, p. 24.]

likeness.”* The treatment has the advantage of saving God from the responsibility of creating man, the only created being which is capable of evil. In the same way the Logos can be used to avoid awkward anthropomorphisms in the Old Testament, or to explain the language of the Bible as to the word of God as the means of creation. To talk about the Logos of Philo as if it had any single function is entirely meaningless, as meaningless as to talk about the single function in a house of the maid of all work.

Now obviously Philo has merely substituted a new word, Logos, for the old word Wisdom.† There is nothing for Wisdom to do. Yet actually the divine Wisdom survives. It is here that we have clear evidence that Philo is simply incorporating a whole mass of traditional exegesis of the Bible, and the tradition is too tenacious for him. Particularly Wisdom is attached by convention to the famous waters‡ of the Old Testament, the well of Rebecca, the river of the city of God, the rock§ in the desert. In one instance we have definite proof that the Logos and Wisdom are the same. For

* So in *De Leg. Alleg.* iii, 31 (*Ma.* i, 106) by implication and clearly in *De Migr. Abr.* i (*Ma.* i, 437). Elsewhere it may be the “powers” who may be the living souls with which the upper air is peopled, including the stars, the angels, the divine attributes or the unseen forces of the *συμπαθεία τῶν δλων*. The share in creation is ascribed to most of these types of “powers”.

† [Just as *Aboth* v, § 1 (Eng. trs. *P.B.S.* p. 199) has *ma’amar*, not *dibbur*. On this, see C. Taylor’s note in his 2nd ed. (Camb. 1897) *in. loc.*]

‡ [The equation of water and Torah is common, e.g. אֵין מִים תָוֹרָה T.B. *Bab. Kam.* 17a (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 57), based on Isa. lv, 1; *Tanh.*, vay-Yakhel, § 8, f. 170a; *Targ.* to *Cant.* iv, 15.]

§ [Thus, in the first story of the rock, on the words “and they found no water” (*Exod.* xv, 22), the *Doreshe Reshumoth* (see above, p. 7) say that the words of the Torah are compared to water.]

manna, we are told in one place, symbolizes the Logos, the water from the rock symbolizes Wisdom, and they are all identical with one another.² Philo could not have introduced this entirely otiose figure of Wisdom, if it were not too deeply embedded in his material for him to get rid of it.

In any case, the concept of the divine Wisdom or the Logos—for after all a divine word is the agent of creation in Genesis—enabled Judaism to claim that Moses had anticipated Plato and had known by revelation the full truth at which philosophers had only guessed. They could support the claim by venerable scriptures, written in one of those barbarous tongues which the Greek world affected to despise but secretly admired. There was, indeed, much in the history and religion of Israel that was strange and even repulsive. But allegory could explain almost anything, and find an ethical meaning in the most trivial detail. Moreover, the explanation needed by the Old Testament was as nothing when compared with the loves and wars of the leading figures of the classical pantheon, which the Stoics had to allegorize. The Jewish apologists, whose works have been incorporated by the Christian apologists of the first three centuries, show how the Jews exploited their advantage. Allegory may be often puerile, and the apologists ignore the extent to which the Old Testament ascribes unethical qualities to the God of Israel. None the less the solid fact remained that Judaism had eliminated from its system polytheism and the grosser elements of natural religion, at a time when the Stoics had succeeded only in reducing them to a comparatively harmless form, by substituting ethical idealism for religion in the

philosopher and leaving the common man to please himself.*

We must bear in mind that this philosophizing is not due to a desire for philosophy for its own sake; it has a very definite purpose. As you know, Philo's work falls into two main divisions; it takes the form of a commentary on the Pentateuch, but the first part is a system of cosmogony and philosophy foisted on to the book of Genesis by an entirely unrestrained use of allegory. The second half contains lives of Abraham, Joseph and Moses and a summary of the Law. The two sections correspond roughly to the divisions which a modern writer of a *Summa Theologiae* would make between a philosophy of religion on the one hand and dogmatic and sacramental theology on the other. Now the cosmogony which I have tried to outline plays a leading role in the first group of writings; in the second, it is less prominent. We have an exposition of the religious system of Judaism, which relies mainly on typology in order to prove the ethical nature of Judaism and is quite prepared to read a cosmic symbolism into the ritual of the Tabernacle. But in this part it becomes

* Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Antt. Rom.* II, 19) admires the sobriety of Roman as compared with Greek mythology, and while admitting the value of allegory observes that it is known only to the educated minority. We may not subscribe to his rather servile admiration of anything Roman, but his attitude towards allegory is instructive. Philo in the tract *De Conf. Ling.* 2 ff. (*Ma.* I, 404) has a long polemic against Jews who object to the mythology of Judaism. He replies (a) that Greek mythology has just as difficult stories as the Tower of Babel, as in the piling of Pelion on Ossa, (b) that the literal exponents of the Scriptures can answer each point, and (c) that the real value lies in the allegory. But in *De Gigant.* 13 (*Ma.* I, 270) he frankly scraps the myth of the giants and the daughters of men, no doubt because it is a variant of the legend of the Titans.

clear that it is Judaism as a religion which matters. The function of the philosophy is to prove that Judaism is intellectually respectable, and so convince the Gentile that it has a claim to be heard, and dissuade the *intelligentsia* of Alexandrine Judaism from abandoning the religion of their fathers. For there must have been this danger. How serious it was we cannot say. Philo's own nephew abandoned Judaism for a distinguished career in the imperial service,³ and Philo mentions Jews who abandoned the externals of Judaism; he refutes them by saying that they might be justified if we were disembodied souls, but not so long as our souls are united to material bodies.⁴ Now that, of course, is a mere commonplace of the schools, dragged in to display erudition, rather than as a serious argument. We find other allusions to such apostasy, which suggest that the danger was neither very serious nor entirely negligible.⁵

Apart from this, I doubt whether all this philosophy meant much. It is a grotesque mistake to suppose that when we find that Wisdom is the wife of God and the Logos their child, we have a re-emergence of the Father, Mother and Child triad of Semitic mythology or the divine paternity of the Egyptian kings.* We are concerned merely with allegories, as, for instance, with an allegory of the High Priest, who may not defile himself by mourning for his father or his mother; the allegorical argument from the Old Testament passage is rendered possible by the fact that there are two terms, Wisdom and Logos, for the same concept; the two are really identical, as is evident from the fact that, in this

* *De Prof.* 20 (*Ma.* 1, 562) and *De Cher.* 13, 14 (*Ma.* 1, 147–8). Norden (*Geburt des Kindes*) goes woefully astray over this passage.

case, a few paragraphs before, the Logos was the fount of Wisdom.* If the scheme meant anything at all, the Logos could not be the fount in one case and the child in the other. Real mythology does not behave like that. At most, the allegory would mean that this is the true triad of father, mother and child, on the principle of the speech of St Paul at Athens, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him we declare unto you." But there is not, I think, even so much allusion as that. It just happens that you have family relations in the Pentateuch on the one side and on the other, in the Alexandrine tradition, God, Wisdom and Logos. The last two are really identical, but they can be used to find an allegorical significance for the families of the Old Testament, and so prove that it contained in the form of revelation truths at which Greek philosophy only guessed.

Thus, really even for Philo, religion comes before philosophy; for the traditional exegesis which lies behind him religion is the only thing that matters. We must not suppose that the preachers and lecturers whom he incorporates knew their philosophy any more than St Paul did. Their philosophy is that of the little collections of opinions of the philosophers which you will find in Diels' *Doxographi Graeci*. Philo may have read his Plato and Posidonius. I am sure the others had not. Indeed, we have one excellent proof that they had not. For there is one passage and just one passage in classical Greek philosophy where the mind or reason which governs the universe is described by the title of Wisdom in a way which does very closely resemble the

* For the Logos as the fount of Wisdom see *De Prof.* 18 (*Ma.* 1, 560).

use of the term in Jewish literature.⁶ Yet the passage is never quoted, though less suitable ones are. Had the Jewish writers known of it, they would have quoted it, and Clement of Alexandria would have copied it from them. The obvious inference is that none of them had got as far as reading the *Philebus*, and therefore that they had very little real knowledge of Greek thought;⁷ they knew it at second-hand, through compilations.

How far did this contact affect the Judaism from which the Rabbinical tradition is a development? There is no reason to suppose that little handbooks of potted philosophy were not current in Jerusalem. After all, St Paul was familiar with these ideas, and though he may have picked them up at Antioch and Tarsus after his conversion, it is quite probable that he learnt them at the feet of Gamaliel, where he says he was educated. And again, why are there hostile allusions to the philosophy of Epicurus in the Rabbis?* Epicureanism was anathema to the theistic philosophers of the Hellenistic world, because it provided an explanation of life and, in some cases at least, a high standard of conduct, while denying the existence of providence. But why should the Rabbis worry about it, unless it was proving attractive? Were some of the Sadducees well educated enough in the handbooks to use Epicurus as an authority against a belief in the Resurrection? Even if it is a mere survival of the Stoic commonplace,

* See the references in *J.E.* s.v. *Apikoros*. The attitude of the Rabbis is essentially that of the theistic philosophy of contemporary paganism; the saying of Hierocles quoted by Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* ix, 5, expresses a view which was common to the later Stoics, and might equally well have been uttered by a Pharisee: *ἡδονὴ τέλος, πόρνης δόγμα· οὐκ ἔστι πρόνοια οὐδὲν, πόρνης δόγμα.* Cf. vol. I, p. 51.

its preservation in Rabbinical literature seems to prove a fairly close contact. Again, Hellenistic cosmology of the type considered above has supplied the Rabbis with abundant food for speculation. We find frequent mentions of the "pattern" or the plan from which God, the divine architect, constructed the world. It is of interest to observe that the "pattern" is described as the רֹאשׁוֹת, the Greek word *δεῖγμα* in a Hebraized form; Plato and Philo usually talk of the divine pattern as a *παράδειγμα*; it is perhaps worth noting that the latter word is that of the classical tradition of philosophy, while the former in the sense of "plan" or outline is found in the papyri,* but rarely if ever in the classical tradition. This suggests that the cosmogony popular among the later Stoics was sufficiently widespread to make its way into Judaism through the medium of popular speech, rather than through the classical writers and Philo; if it had been taken from them, we should expect *παράδειγμα*. It may be noticed that in *Bereshith Rabba*⁸ the divine Wisdom, as God's plan of the cosmos, is a *πίναξ* or *διψθέρα*; here we have a highly concrete version of the regular cosmogony, in which God appears as the architect of the universe, working from the living and divine original of the

* Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*, s.v. The divine pattern as רֹאשׁוֹת is often coupled with the Hebrew יְצֵא, *me'en*, which means "essence" rather than "pattern". But it would be hard to say whether the Platonic *ἰδέα* is primarily the "essence" inherent in the particular, or the universal of which the particular is a copy. For the use of the term *δεῖγμα*, or sometimes *δεῖγματήριον*, in Hebrew, cf. Levy's *Lexicon*, and Krauss' *Lehnwörter*, s.v.: also Theodor's note in his edition of *Gen.R.* p. 96 foot. [For a *δεῖγμα*, in this world, of the world to come, see T.B. *Sanh.* 98b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 429). Here *δεῖγμα* is rather a parallel to or an example of something.] See *Addenda*, p. 111.

Timaeus, which becomes the Logos in Philo. The Wisdom of Proverbs is not a plan but an assistant.*

Again, when we find an exact parallel drawn between God, who fills the whole world, and the soul of man, which fills his whole body,⁹ the correspondence with the Stoic parallel of macrocosm and microcosm is so exact that, in spite of G. F. Moore, I cannot persuade myself there is no connexion. Or the curious use of the word מָקוֹם (*Makōm*) for God seems hard to explain, until we remember that, for Philo, God is described as a "place" in various O.T. passages, because all things exist in Him. And again, is not the *Memra* the Alexandrine Logos deprived of its former glories? I cannot discuss these questions. I will merely throw out a suggestion that a thorough investigation of Philo by a competent Rabbinical scholar might throw a valuable light on the development of rabbinical theology.†

So much for cosmogony. Judaism was no less at home in other branches of philosophy. Naturally the Jewish belief in the Resurrection is changed to belief in the immortality of the soul, for the material is always evil in the Philonic convention; the fall of Adam can be explained as the union of the spiritual with the material; so in each of us the body is the tomb of the soul.

* The divine pattern of the universe seems clearly derived from the *Timaeus*. But it had affinities with the Jewish (and widespread Oriental) ideas of divine "patterns" of which earthly sanctuaries were the copy. The conception appears in Exod. xxv, 9; cf. *Exod.R.* xxxv, § 6 (Germ. trs. W. p. 267 foot); *Num.R.* xv, § 4 (Germ. trs. W. p. 396). It would be hard to say whether the pattern of the Temple in *Wisd.* ix, 8 is drawn from the Greek or the Oriental source.

† I regret that I have been unable to take account of I. Heinemann's *Philons Griechische u. Jid. Bildung*, Breslau, 1932.

The soul can be represented even as a fragment of that fifth ethereal essence of which the firmament is composed; for the later followers of Aristotle, following the Stoic lead, admitted the immortality of the soul and identified it with the fifth essence, which thus becomes practically the ethereal fire of Stoicism.¹⁰ Again, Balaam is credited with the startling statement that the bodies of the Jews are formed of mortal seed, but the souls of divine.* This is the Orphic view, which was destined to be a cardinal doctrine of the later Gnostic systems. Elsewhere, the angels of Judaism appear as the *δαιμόνια* of Plato, some of them possessing bodies, such as the stars, others disembodied, but used by God for the service of man, while the union of soul and body may represent a fall of the individual soul into the material world; spirits embodied in the stars are, of course, embodied in a higher form of the material, if we like, in the ethereal.¹¹

I fear there is no time for further details; I will close with a single instance of the lengths to which this kind of allegorizing can go. When Moses spent forty days and nights in Mount Horeb, what was he doing? He was listening to the music of the spheres. It is quite

* *De Vit. Moys.* 1, 50 (*Ma.* II, 124). The whole passage runs: τὰ μὲν σώματα αὐτοῖς ἔξ ἀνθρωπίνων διεπλάσθη σπερμάτων ἐκ θείων αἱ φυχαὶ. Διὸ καὶ γεγόνασιν ἀγχίστοροι θεοῦ. The last phrase reveals much. It is the *θεῶν ἀγχίστοροι* of Aeschylus quoted by Plato, *Rep.* 391 e (the same idea appears in *Timaeus* 40 d). Of these kinsfolk of the gods, who in the *Timaeus* are an authority for mythology, Orpheus is chief: but it is an Orphic doctrine, that the soul of man is a divine seed in a human body. Cf. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, pp. 172 sqq. The Orphic initiate was of divine seed; I cannot find evidence that he claimed to be *θεῶν ἀγχίστορος* as was Orpheus himself; the conflation of the ideas may be the work of a Stoic allegorizer or of a Jewish propagandist.

natural when you come to think of it. The music of the spheres is the expression in harmony of the divine purpose and method of creation; the Torah is God's purpose in creation. Therefore the Torah is the music of the spheres.*

We have seen Greek thought pressed into the service of Jewish monotheism and Jewish beliefs; it is equally used in the service of the religious institutions of Judaism. The mystical value which Pythagoras attached to the number seven, the number of the planets, the notes of the musical scale and many other things, was familiar to Moses, who observed it by setting every seventh day apart for rest and worship.¹² Thus, Pythagoras himself inculcates the Sabbath. This is fairly obvious. A more interesting point is that the Tabernacle and its furniture are an elaborate symbolism of the cosmos. In *Wisdom xviii*, 24 the staying

* *De Somn.* i, 6 (*Ma.* i, 626). The music of the spheres from *Timaeus* 36b, following the Pythagorean tradition. It apparently penetrated into Rabbinical Judaism: thus (*Gen.R.* vi, § 7 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 25)). R. Levi (either b. Sisi or Levi II) said that there are three things of which the sound reaches from one end of the world to the other, yet human beings hear not the sound; the day, the rain and the soul when it departeth. Maimonides, *Guide* ii, 8 (Eng. trs. *M. Friedländer*, p. 163) has this passage in mind when he writes on the music of the spheres: he notes that the Rabbis derived it from Pythagoras.

[See the *Baraita* in *T.B. Yoma* 20b foot (Germ. trs. *G.* ii, 804 top): "were it not for (the sound of) the orb of the sun, the noise (*hamôn*) of Rome would be heard" (and vice versa). Then follow the three "noises".]

It is interesting to note that the mediaeval censors objected to the reference to the "noise of Rome", taking it as a cryptic allusion to the Pope. The *Baraita* is cited in ch. i of Isaac Arama's '*Akedath Yishak*' (ed. Venice, 1565, f. 7 a foot), where Arama combats the assertion that the universe is founded on chance. See *C.H.B.* pp. 79 and 87.]

of the plague by Aaron¹³ was due to the fact that on his long robe was the whole cosmos, the glories of the fathers on his breastplate and the majesty of God on his diadem. This rather cryptic statement is fully explained when we turn to Philo and Josephus. The long robe of blue or black is the air which is black by nature and fills the space between moon and earth; the flowers (from the LXX), pomegranates and bells stand for earth and water, which are at the bottom of the universe; the ephod represents the firmament of heaven; the two emeralds (beryls or onyx in R.V.) with which it is clasped, the sun and moon, or the two hemispheres of the sky; the six names of tribes on each clasp, six circles of the zodiac each; the twelve stones on the breastplate, the twelve signs of the zodiac. The golden diadem bearing the name of God represents His goodness and mercy which hold all things in being.* Philo adds that the High Priest, as intercessor

* Philo, *De Vit. Moys.* iii, 12 sqq. (*Ma.* ii, 153 sqq.); Jos. *Antt.* iii, ch. vii, 7 (183 sqq.). I have followed Philo's version; the variations in Josephus need not concern us.

The conception that the whole cosmos is the robe of God, or the body which He animates (as in the Pseudo-Orphic lines quoted by Eus. *Prep. Evan.* (iii, 9. 1 sqq.) was a natural development of the Platonic-Stoic philosophy, which was concerned to find a system of monotheism which could be combined with the existing cults of paganism; if the whole cosmos is the outward manifestation of an indwelling divinity, any part of it can be worshipped, since the object worshipped is the immanent divinity. The whole train of thought is alien to Judaism; but it is introduced in order to show that Judaism is aware of the truth that God is immanent in the whole creation.

[It is of interest to observe that symbolism of the High Priest's robe has penetrated into Rabbinical theology, e.g. *Jer. Yoma*, vii, § 3, f. 44b, line 43 (French trs. S. v, 244); *Lev.R.* x, § 6 (Germ. trs. W. p. 66).]

[For the robe of God as the creative agency of light, cf. *Midr.*

for the world, thus ceases to be a mere man and becomes himself a cosmos on a small scale. It is unfortunate that the High Priest's robe contained no hebdomad.

Now here we have a tradition preserved independently in three of our principal sources. It is still more interesting to observe that Eusebius preserves a passage of Porphyry, describing an Egyptian symbolism of the cosmos, apparently equated with Ptah, the creator, wearing a many-coloured robe, and having on his head a golden sphere; the robe symbolizes the variegated stars of the heaven, the sphere the shape of the cosmos.¹⁴ Here we have an interesting case in which cult institutions of Judaism and Egypt are expounded in precisely the same conventional symbolism; the doctrine is derived from the pseudo-Orphic literature of Stoicism, and transferred from Zeus to the High Priest.*

It must be remembered that the one Temple of Judaism, its one centre of sacrifice in a remote pilgrim city, had a distinct missionary value.† On the one

Shohet Tobi on Ps. cxv, 4 (Germ. trs. W. p. 114); *Gen.R.* III, § 4 (Germ. trs. W. p. 11); *Exod.R.* I, § 1 (Germ. trs. W. p. 335); *Lev.R.* xxxi, § 7 (Germ. trs. W. p. 219); *Tanh.*, vay-Yakhel, § 6, f. 168b; *Targ.* to *Cant.* v, 10.]

[For colour-symbolism and the High Priest's prayer, see *Targum to Cant.* IV, 3.]

* Orphic literature of a Stoic type was popular in the first century B.C., and was freely adapted for Jewish and Christian purposes. Cf. Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes*, III, 599 sqq. and Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, p. 255.

† It is curious to observe that there was actually another Temple in Egypt, when Philo wrote, since the Temple of Onias was not destroyed until the time of Vespasian (Josephus, *B.J.* vii, ch. x, 2 (421) sqq.). Hirsch, *Jews' College Jubilee Volume* (London, 1906), p. 70, is clearly right in emphasizing its insignificance.

The Temple at Jerusalem was regarded with some veneration

hand, it was remote and impressive; on the other hand it could, if necessary, be ignored. Philo at one point inserts an unqualified condemnation of all sacrifices except "the fireless altars round which the virtues dance in chorus". No doubt the passage was taken over by a synagogue preacher from an exponent of the common view which appears in the Hermetic literature, that God needs nothing and therefore the only offering we can make to him is that of thanks and praise.* It was convenient for the exponent of this view that sacrifice might be offered only in Jerusalem, which was a long way off. Generally, however, we have a very high estimate of the value of the cultus of Jerusalem. No doubt this reflects the impression which the sanctuary made on the exile whose religion in theory was centred on the Temple which he hoped to visit one day as a pilgrim; distance saved him from coming into contact with the sordid politicians of the house of Annas.† Hence at one point we find that the High Priest is of more than human nature, being the inter-in Gentile circles, since we read of offerings brought to it by Gentiles who were not proselytes (cf. *Terummoth* III, § 9 (Eng. trs. D. p. 55)).

* For the Hermetic view cf. *Asclepius* III, 41a. Naturally the view could be accommodated to Judaism, in which the tradition that prayer, repentance, etc., are better than sacrifice developed independently out of such passages as Ps. LI, 17. But the Philonic passage (*De Plant.* 25 (*Ma.* I, 345)) shows no affinity with the Jewish tradition and is purely philosophic in its outlook.

† [For the ignorance of High Priests in the period before the Destruction, see *Yoma* I, §§ 2, 3 (Eng. trs. D. p. 162); for the sale of the High Priestly Office, see *Sifre*, § 131, f. 48b, line 7; *Pes.K.* f. 177a (Germ. trs. W. p. 259). For *Hanan Bisha*, "evil Annas", see *T.B. Bekh.* 50b foot (Germ. trs. G. ix, 172): for the "violent" High Priests, who took offerings by force, see *T.B. Pes.* 57a (Germ. trs. G. II, 524). For the families of Boethus, with their "lances" (or, forks), and of Hanin "with their tale bearings" (ib.); Löw, 193.]

mediary through whom man propitiates God and God bestows his benefits on man.¹⁵ More important is that of a passage where the High Priest's function is to offer prayers for the nation in order that he may join it into one communion (*kouwvia*), similar to that of the several members of the human body. The thought that the members of the state or of mankind are all members of one body is, of course, a Stoic commonplace; it is interesting to find it in Philo, since it shows that Jewish-Hellenistic thought was familiar with the conception which Paul develops into his doctrine that the Church is the body of Christ.*

Another statement about the High Priest is valuable for the light it throws on the relation of Judaism to the mystery cults, not the Eastern cults of the later Empire, but the classical mysteries, especially those of Eleusis, as interpreted by the Orphics, and those of Isis and Sarapis, a cult of Ptolemaic institution, largely inspired by Eleusinian beliefs and practices.¹⁶ The name of God is inscribed on his mitre; it may be uttered only in the holy place, by those whose ears and tongues are cleansed by Wisdom.† Here we may compare the statement of Josephus that Moses, at the burning bush, asked God His name in order that, when he sacrificed, he might call on Him by name to be present. Moses is then told the name, which, hitherto, had not been

* *De Spec. Leg.* 23 (*Ma.* II, 321). The classical instance of the Stoic commonplace is the story of Menenius Agrippa in *Livy* II, 32 and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antt. Rom.* VI, 86, cf. III, 11. For the High Priest's prayer, see vol. I, p. 129; and above, p. 79.

† *De Vit. Moys.* III, 11 (*Ma.* II, 152). Originally of course the secret of a mystery-cult may be revealed only to the initiates. At a later stage, initiation is held to imply purification from sin. Here, the priests in the Temple are identified with the initiates and then allegorized over again.

revealed; “about which”, says Josephus, “it is not lawful (*θεμιτὸν*) for me to speak”. This word is a technical term of mystery-cults or of religious secrets which may not be revealed; I should imagine that here Josephus has in mind the belief in the secret names of the gods of ancient cities, rather than the mystery-cults. Of course the treatment of the name of God as a “mystery” is due to the fact that the name of God was by the time when Philo, or his source, and Josephus wrote the words I have quoted, never pronounced except by the High Priest on the Day of Atonement. But the opportunity is taken to impart to Judaism the flavour of a mystery-cult.* The same purpose manifests itself in the treatment of the Exodus by Josephus; it is a divine act of *σωτηρία* accompanied by divine *ἐπιφανεῖαι*, the terms used being technical religious terms especially familiar in the cult of the Macedonian dynasties and the Isis-Sarapis cult.†

Yet here again Josephus is only translating into terms of the mystery-cults a conception which would appear to be of purely Jewish origin. The deliverance (*Ge'ullah*) of Israel from Egypt was regarded as early as the days of Akiba;‡ as a type of deliverance from the

* For esoteric forms of the Tetragrammaton ('*Ani wa-hu*', etc.), see the forthcoming *Rabbinic Anthology* by Montefiore and Loewe, index, s.v.

† The names Soter, Epiphanes (and Euergetes, which Philo frequently applies to God) are evidences of the usage. Cf. also Artimidorus, *Oneirocritica*, II, 39, p. 139 of Serapis, Isis, Anubis and Harpocrates: *ἀεὶ γὰρ σωτῆρες νενομισμένοι εἰσὶν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν εἰς—ζοχατον ἐλθόντων κλίδυνον.*

‡ [For Akiba, cf. the final benediction in the ante-prandial portion of the Passover *Haggadah* (domestic service), with commentaries of Abudarham and Abravanel. Cf. also *T.B. Pes.* 117b (Germ. trs. G. II, 733), where Raba declares that the formula for redemption, “Who redeemest Israel”, is a prayer for future redemption.]

present age into the future, and this belief has survived in the mediaeval Passover hymns.* The position of the Passover in the religious life of Judaism would naturally lead to its association with that eternal deliverance for which the followers of the Pharisaic tradition hoped; there was no need of Gentile influence to make the Exodus a type of salvation.† But Josephus has dressed up a native Jewish idea in language drawn from the mysteries. Philo uses similar language about the Exodus; but there is an even more striking passage in which he defends the existence of mysteries in religion.¹⁷ If civic cults have their secret mysteries, far more should the true rites, which lead to holiness, be kept back from ribald ears, and be uttered only to worshippers of the true God, who have rejected idolatry and been purified with cleansing rites, both in body and soul, according to the customs of the fathers, and given

* [For the collocation, in the form of type and antitype, of "the Egyptian Passover" and "the Passover of the future", many examples could be cited. English versions will be found in *P.B.D.A.* (Passover volume), pp. 220 (verse rendering by Nina Salaman), 173, 248. This *motif* goes back to the distinction between the Seventh Day of Passover, the traditional day of crossing the Red Sea, when the lessons are Exod. XIII, 17–XV, 26 and II Sam. xxii, and the Eighth Day, which was eschatological, Isa. x, 32–xii, 6 being read, in many cases with the Targum, in which the eschatology is developed.]

† [It is associated with the *Shema'*, morning and evening (*Ber.* I, § 5 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 3): note the eschatological connexion); with the phylacteries (*P.B.S.* p. 15) and with the '*Amidah*' (ib. pp. 43 and 49); the *Wethikin* (see above, p. 34*, and refs. given there), used to make no pause between the mention of Egypt and the '*Amidah*' ("They joined the *Ge'ullah*, redemption, to the *Tefillah*, prayer"), see *C.* p. 55, note 7 and *P.B.S.* p. 44. To this day no congregational Amen is recited, after the benediction on p. 44, before the '*Amidah*', so as not to break the connexion of "Redemption" and "Prayer".]

pledges of their fitness to join in the festival (cf. Exod. XII, 44), lest having partaken of holy food they should be filled with satiety and make a drunken mockery of holy things. The terms used are all technical terms of the mysteries; the meaning is that the convert must receive the proselyte's bath and be circumcised before he may eat the Passover. I need hardly add that elsewhere Philo condemns all mysteries; if good, they should be public; if evil, not at all. This is a favourite commonplace of philosophy of the Epicurean school, a good instance of the impartiality with which Philo borrows.* But Judaism was quite ready to exploit the instinct of curiosity which is always a potent influence especially in religion.† In the instances we have considered it is fairly clear that the Passover, as the central feast of the Jewish year, and the Paschal meal are being treated as the rite or *δρώμενος* of which the Exodus is the "myth"; it must be remembered that the Passover rite has a distinctly "sacramental" character in its insistence that "it is we who are redeemed from Egypt".¹⁸

A curious instance of the same kind of thing may be found in Josephus. In his story of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, he says that it is not lawful (*θεμιτὸν*) for him to give the words of the Decalogue, since they were the words of God Himself.¹⁹ Now Jewish and Christian writers are very fond of summaries of the Exodus leading up to the giving of the Law; in the Christian writers, this is coupled, in several instances, with the quite unorthodox suggestion that the

* *De Vict. Off.* 12 (*Ma.* II, 260). For a similar Epicurean view cf. Lucian, *Demonax* 2.

† On this see above, p. 13, the esoteric school.

Decalogue was the true Law, and that the rest was a second Law imposed as a punishment for the sin of the Golden Calf.* The frequency of the theme suggests that it is drawn from the usage of the synagogues of the Dispersion, in which it would be natural to instruct the convert in the history of the Exodus as a preliminary to instructing him in his religious duties,† while the language of Josephus suggests a local custom of treating the actual words of the Decalogue as a “mystery”, like the Christian creeds, to be revealed only to the initiate though the general tenour of Decalogue or Creed would be explained.

This point raises an interesting problem, which I can only raise, but cannot answer with certainty. Later Judaism was driven by the “cavillings of heretics”‡ to exclude the Decalogue from the service of the Synagogue and to prohibit its use in phylacteries with the *Shema*.§ The heretics here are, no doubt, Christians.

* Although unorthodox, the view is extremely ancient; it is implied in Stephen's speech, Acts vii, 38 (cf. *Didascalia* vi, ch. xvi, 7).

† [Even a born Israelite was taught to regard the Exodus as a preliminary or condition for accepting God's Kingdom: see *Exod.R.* xxix, § 3 (Germ. trs. W. p. 208 foot) (wrongly paginated).]

‡ [For the Decalogue in the Temple ritual, see *T.B.Ber.* 11b (Germ. trs. G. 1, 41): for its exclusion from the service outside the Temple, see ib., 12a (G. ib.) and parallel in *Jer. Ber.* 1, § 8, f. 3c, line 33 (Eng. trs. S. p. 21) where R. Samuel b. Nahman says that the *Minim* declared that the Decalogue alone had been given on Sinai. Possibly there is an anti-Christian warning in *Sifre*, f. 74a, line 5, not to regard the Law as an obsolete διάταγμα but as ever new.]

§ *Jud.* 1, 291 and n. 64, where, however, Moore, while rightly pointing out that the view that the Decalogue is the only true law, and that the rest is a punishment for the sin of the Golden Calf, is not orthodox Christian doctrine, fails to note that it is a fairly widely spread opinion in orthodox Christian writers. For phylacteries and *mezuzoth*, cf. *Sifre*, va-'eth-hannan, § 34 and § 35, f. 74a and b. See below, p. 111, *Addenda*.

Yet it would appear that some Jewish circles had at an even earlier date attached a special significance to the Decalogue, and had been compelled to surround it with a veil of mystery in order to avoid the danger of blasphemy by Gentile opponents. It is easy to see that a parody of the Decalogue would be peculiarly offensive to Jewish ears, even though in theory all parts of the Bible were equally sacred.* Although the Rabbis, like fundamentalist Jews or Christians, would profess to believe in the inspiration of all the Scriptures, they would, in practice, be compelled to attach a

* [See *Sifre*, va'-eth-hannan, f. 74a, §34, lines 15–28 and f. 74b, §35, lines 15–22. It is interesting to note that the Nash Papyrus in the University Library, Cambridge, contains both the Decalogue and the *Shema'*. When the recitation of the Decalogue was stopped, expedients were devised to preserve its memory ritually. Thus, R. Levi declared that the *Shema'* contained—or could be interpreted as—a synopsis of the Decalogue (*Jer. Ber.* 1, §8, f. 3c, line 10 (Eng. trs. *S.* p. 20)) and Rabbinic prayer books, such as the *Tefillath ha-Hodesh* or the *Derekh ha-Hayyim*, still print such exegesis in small type in the body of the *Shema'*. The Nash Papyrus may be a heretical prayer book, see vol. 1, p. 141, note 3. The Decalogue alone, without the *Shema'*, was sometimes written as a scroll and the use of such a scroll was deprecated during prayers, since the risk of dropping it might tend to divert attention from prayers. It is, therefore, logical to assume that at other times there was no objection to such a scroll. The Decalogue was said to symbolize the Torah, which had 613 commandments, because it, the Decalogue, had 620 letters, i.e. 613 + the 7 Rabbinical commandments. Hence it was the “Crown” (*Kether*) of the Torah: the letters of *Kether* make 620. (For the above, see vol. 1, p. 111, note 1, and I. Abrahams in *K.* p. 40.) It may therefore be suggested that a Jewish reply to a Jewish-Christian belief that the Decalogue alone, of all the Torah, remained valid, was this symbolic assertion that the Decalogue, on the contrary, implied the whole Torah *plus* the Rabbinic commands. It should be noted that the Decalogue contains 620 letters: “this teaches us that these Ten Commandments bear within themselves the implications of all the precepts of the Torah” (M. Hyamson, *Sabbath and Festival addresses*, New York, 1936, p. 122). See below, p. 111, *Addenda*.]

higher significance to some parts than others, as containing the essentials of religion, while the missions of the Dispersion would be compelled to provide the convert with a summary of his duties. Thus we have two apparently distinct reasons for withdrawing the Decalogue from public use. I am inclined to suggest that in the first instance the withdrawal took place in the synagogues of the Dispersion as a precaution against blasphemous parodies, and that it was this atmosphere of special sanctity which suggested the view, put forward by some Christian writers, that the Decalogue was really the original divine revelation.

In any case all this borrowing of external trappings remains external. Have we any real evidence of syncretism between Judaism and pagan religion? We have some, but very little. The only case which is entirely clear to me is that quoted by Ramsay for the Jewish colonies of Phrygia.²⁰ Here we find a certain Julia Severa who is a High Priestess of the Imperial cult and *ἀγωνοθέτις*, while her husband, G. Tyrrhonius Cladus, was a ruler of the Synagogue for life. It is possible that we have further evidence of aberration from the normal standards of Judaism in Phrygia in St Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, where a sort of Gnosticism is combined with certain elements of Judaism.²¹ Here, however, there are some important points to notice. The cultus of the Emperor and the elements of heathenism inseparable from the public games are the kind of worship which a rather easy-going conscience might manage to accept as being of a social and political rather than a purely religious character. The evidence of Colossians is rather vague; but it would seem that the kind of attitude towards astrology which

we find in St Paul himself²² is taken with sufficient seriousness to lead to some attempt to counteract the influence of the planets by special religious observances. This is very unorthodox, but not incompatible with monotheism. But the most striking fact is that in this one case where we have fairly certain evidence of unorthodoxy, we find that the Rabbis were quite aware of the fact. The luxury of Phrygia had separated the Jews of that region from their brethren, and the Rabbis knew all about it.²³ It is hard to avoid the conclusion that such aberrations were rare. As far as the other supposed instances of syncretism between Judaism and paganism are concerned, I am compelled to be dogmatic and to say that the evidence leaves me entirely unconvinced that we have anything more than a certain laxity in the remoter synagogues of the Dispersion.* We have a great deal of evidence both

* The only serious evidence is that of the inscriptions from the Bosphorus, which are printed in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v, 90 sqq., with a note by Professor Kirsopp Lake, who rightly observes that the reference to "the Most High God" need not be Jewish, but fails to observe that the one inscription out of six which recognizes Zeus, Earth and Sun as well as the Most High God, has no special reference to Judaism; the others have no reference to Zeus but only two of them refer to the Synagogue of the Jews or to anything specifically Jewish; the Jewish inscriptions have no reference to the Most High God. Thus we have two clearly Jewish inscriptions, with no reference to the Most High God (from Panticapaeum), two inscriptions to the Most High God from Gorgippia, of which one refers to Zeus, Earth and Sun as well, and two inscriptions from Tanais to the Most High God, but no reference either to Judaism or to any other form of cult. The remaining evidence is very thin indeed. There may have been a tendency to more serious syncretism in some parts of Phrygia, but Oesterley's attempt to prove this in *The Labyrinth*, p. 115, shows how many conjectures are needed in order to make out a case. [On the two Panticapaeum inscriptions, see Addenda, p. 111.]

in literature and in inscriptions as to the Judaism of the time and the evidence of syncretism of Judaism with Gentile cults, when it is carefully sifted and the conjectures left out, boils down to singularly little. Even the Essenes, who are the classical instance, leave me entirely unconvinced. Josephus says that they offer their worship to the sun and attributes their strict observance of the Deuteronomic principles of camp sanitation to their fear of defiling his rays.* Philo has no reference to this worship of the sun. Now Greek thought never understood a religion which worshipped a single personal God. It could accept a monotheistic philosophy and a religion which worshipped the one divine principle manifested in various gods, not

For a full discussion of the meaning of the term Hypsistos and for the extent to which it implies Jewish influence cf. Roberts, Skeat and Nock, *The Gild of Zeus Hypsistos*, in *Harvard Theological Review*, xxix, i (Jan. 1936, pp. 39ff.): "Jewish influence, though sometimes a contributory factor, was not all-important."

* *B.J.* ii, ch. viii, 5 (128 sqq.).

[One is reminded of the incident recorded in *Tos. H^agigah* iii, 35 (Z. p. 238, line 22): "It once happened that they had to clean the Menorah (Candlestick in the Temple) and the Sadducees exclaimed 'come and watch these Pharisees cleansing the radiance of the moon'." In *Jer. H^agigah* iii, §8, f. 79d, line 32 (French trs. S. vi, p. 302) the reading is "orb of the Sun". Cf. also the controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees whether an unbroken stream of liquid was subject to infection (*Yadayim*, iv, §7 (Eng. trs. D. 784)).]

Here there would seem to be an allusion to the conception that the seven-branched candlestick symbolizes the seven planets, the middle branch representing the sun as the chief of the planets. Philo, *Quis Rer. Div. Her. Sit.* 45 (*Ma.* i, 504). Since the sun's creation on the fourth day with three days before, belonging to the æon and three after belonging to time, symbolize God and his two powers, we are here in the main stream of astral symbolism. The jest of the Sadducees may have been intended to suggest that the Pharisees took too much interest in this symbolism.

in one personal God. Hence Hecataeus' account of Judaism in Diodorus Siculus* tells us that the Jews worship the vault of heaven, by which he means to identify the God of the Jews with the divine principle concentrated in the firmament; Strabo, probably following Posidonius, says the same.²⁴ In other words you identified the one God of the Jews with whatever you regarded as the supreme deity or source of deity. In the case of Josephus we probably have an account by an observer acquainted with the solar monotheism of Syria²⁵ who identifies the one God of Israel with the sun and assumes that their scrupulous sanitary observances are due to a view diametrically opposed to the commonplace argument that the sun is not defiled because his rays fall on a cesspool.²⁶† The strong Hellenistic colouring appears when Josephus tells us that the Essenes believe that the souls of the righteous dead go to the Islands of the Blest. Josephus tells us that he had passed some time among the Essenes, which may be true,²⁷ but that is no reason for supposing that he has not simply incorporated an account from someone else. Philo has certainly done so, for the greater part of his account of them consists in telling us that they go to the Synagogue every Saturday.‡ On close inspection, the solar element in Essene religion dwindles to nothing

* Diodorus Siculus, xi, 3, 4, the most intelligent account of Judaism in Greek literature.

† See p. 90*, for the contamination of liquids.

‡ Compare his account in *Quod Omn. Prob. Lib. 12* (*Ma. II, 458*) with his account of the synagogue worship of ordinary Judaism in *De Vit. Moys. I, 27* (*Ma. II, 167*). Philo has simply incorporated an account (by someone who had seen the Essenes, but did not know that the Jews observed the Sabbath) without noticing that the account implies that only the Essene goes to the Synagogue!

but superficial Gentile observation and careless incorporation by Josephus. The Psalms with which the Essenes worship the sun are simply morning prayers: * no doubt a heathen, hearing Jews reciting the 19th Psalm, might think they were worshipping the sun.

On the other hand, outside the canon of the Scriptures, Judaism was quite ready to borrow from the Gentile world an amazing quantity of Midrashic interpretation and enlargement of the Bible story. Probably the beginning of this kind of expansion came from Palestine; the Book of Jubilees † seems entirely Palestinian in its outlook and is probably older than anything we possess from the Dispersion. Moreover, Philo seems to preserve Midrashic themes which belong to the conditions of Palestine rather than to those of Alexandria. Why, for instance, should Joseph be the type of politician who succeeds only with difficulty in saving his own soul, while his brethren choose the better part of the contemplative life.²⁸ Why should Leah be superior to Rachel?²⁹ How can Judah's somewhat squalid affair with Tamar symbolize a pure love of virtue for its own sake?³⁰ I cannot help supposing that all this far-fetched exegesis has its origin in a system of Midrash which was concerned to glorify Judah and explain away the somewhat obvious preference of some parts of the Old Testament for Joseph, the ancestor of the Samaritans.‡

* On this see p. 34*.

† See vol. I, p. 170.

‡ This can only be offered as a conjecture, but it corresponds to the treatment by Philo of the slaughter of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi (*de Migr. Abr.* 39 (*Ma.* I, 472)), which corresponds to the justification of their action by Jubilees xxx, 4 sqq.; *Test. Levi* 6 and 7; *Judith* ix, 2. In *Num.R.* xxi, 3 (in some texts, xxi, 4 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 508 foot)), which deals with the killing by Phineas of Zimri, the Simeonite, the opportunity is taken of

Or again, why should the destruction of Nadab and Abihu in Lev. x mean that they are souls so consumed by the fire of the love of God and virtue that they die and are rapt out of this world in order that they may live to the eternal?³¹ I would suggest that between this far-fetched interpretation and the original there lie several stages of exegesis to explain away the rather arbitrary act of divine vengeance: the Rabbinical view, that they had drunk wine before approaching the altar, is a specimen of the sort of explanation which was felt to be needed.*

But this type of literature found an enormous expansion in Hellenistic circles. Abraham not only rejected idolatry in his childhood: he also invented astrology and then saw through it.³² Moses conquered the Egyptians and was the father of the arts and civilization of Egypt. It is perhaps an excess of zeal when Artabanus ascribes to him the invention of the Egyptian worship of the dog, the cat and the ibis.³³ His exploits bear a distinct family resemblance to those justifying Simeon (conveniently forgetting the indictment against him) by declaring that Zimri, by his unchastity, had disgraced his family, for Simeon, his ancestor, was the first to be zealous for chastity. For a Rabbinical explanation of the incident of Judah and Tamar (i.e. that she was a daughter of a merchant, not a Canaanite, and Judah married her), cf. *Targ. Onkelos*, *in loc.* According to *Targ. Ps.-Jon.*, Judah made her a proselyte and married her. But Philo's treatment would seem, like that noted in regard to Simeon and Levi, to go back to an earlier stage, when Judah had not merely to be excused but to be praised. On this see vol. i, p. 135, note 2.

* [This type of exegesis is called *Semukhin* (continuity of passages): the Nadab and Abihu incident (Lev. x, 1-7) is followed immediately (verse 8) by a prohibition addressed to the priest against drinking wine before going in to minister "that he die not". Other reasons for the death of Aaron's sons are given in *Pes.K. f. 172b* (Germ. trs. W. pp. 250-1).]

of Osiris.³⁴ According to Josephus, the killing of the children of the Hebrews was the result of a prophecy by an Egyptian scribe that Moses would deliver the children of Israel; a similar slaughter of the innocents appears in Suetonius' account of Augustus.³⁵ The reason why Moses described his own death was his fear that the people should suppose him to have been translated to heaven and worship him, after the fashion of such cult-heroes as Romulus;* a mysterious death which might be a translation to heaven was of course *de rigueur* in such cases.† Eusebius preserves a considerable amount of this literature; an enormous amount has perished. There was even an account of the Exodus in the form of a Greek tragedy by a certain Ezekiel; enough has been preserved to make us thankful that the rest has been lost.³⁶ The speeches which Josephus puts into the mouth of Moses are typical of the history of the period, and worthy rivals in dulness to those which Dionysius of Halicarnassus puts into the mouth of the kings and consuls of ancient Rome.

There is one further point we may consider. The temper of the age was tending increasingly to the belief that the universe was controlled by fate, a relentless power ordering all things through the planets and their course through the fixed stars. It was entirely pessimistic; and therefore harmonized well with the experience of mankind in that iron age which witnessed the collapse of the empires of the successors of Alexander

* [Similarly, Jacob asks Joseph to bury him in Palestine lest the Egyptians deify him, *Gen.R.* xcvi, § 5 (Germ. trs. W. p. 473).]

† Josephus, *Antt.* iv, ch. viii, 48 (326), and compare the somewhat sceptical account of Romulus' death in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, II, 56.

and the Roman republic. How did Judaism regard astrology and fate? In the first place, we find a curious smattering of astrology, especially in the writings of Enoch, who was generally supposed to be the father of astrology, and who is therefore, in the two books that go by his name, credited with revelations which show him exactly how the heavenly bodies are worked. It is equally obvious that as an astronomer he knows nothing about it. What we have is not practical astronomy or astrology, but a pretence of erudition: the implication is that all the importance attached to it by some people is mere foolishness. Enoch knew it all long ago and wrote down all that mattered. But that is only one point of view which the Hellenistic Jew might take. Obviously he could not accept the whole scheme as it stood, for that implied that everything was ordered by the fate which was determined by, or which determined, the courses of the stars; no room was left for God or providence.

Yet it was possible to accept all or most of it with surprisingly small modifications. After all the heavenly bodies were set as "signs"; it says so in Gen. 1, 15. We find this view frequently in Philo, though as a rule he limits the use of astrology to that natural astrology which took the celestial phenomena as a rough guide to the seasons.³⁷ You need not be an astrologer to take the setting of the Pleiades as a sign that it is time to plough or dangerous to sail. I always start pruning my roses on Lady Day, not out of devotion to the "Rosa Mystica" of the Litany of Loretto, nor yet because of the deep religious significance of the vernal equinox, but because it is an easy date to remember, and it is a good thing to have a fixed date for a major

horticultural operation. Philo's general view is that there is a sympathy between all the parts of nature, as a result of which the whole is held together by the unseen power, which is the goodness of God (this is pure Stoicism of the later type, modelled on the *Timaeus*, but introducing quite a Jewish view of the divine attribute of goodness).* Other views which Philo incorporates include the belief that the planets are animated bodies; the Cherubim of Gen. iii, 24 can symbolize the sphere of the fixed stars and the sphere of the planets respectively, while the flaming sword is the revolution of the vault of heaven. But while the movement of the planets from east to west is determined, their movement from north to south is voluntary, though they adhere to the order appointed by the creator.³⁸ There is no such thing as fate in the strict sense; there are chains of cause and effect, but God is above them and orders the course of the world by His government.† Elsewhere the planets and fixed stars are the rulers (archons) of the world and the inhabitants of the sublunar sphere are the subjects; the archons are visible gods, subordinates, who are liable to be called upon to give account of their government of the universe, though owing to their

* *De Migr. Abr.* 32 (*Ma.* i, 464), with obvious reminiscences of *Timaeus* 29*e* and 41*b*. Such "powers" as the goodness of God here represent a more Jewish and less Greek strain in Philo's sources: the "power" of goodness here ought to be the Logos if Philo's philosophy were serious. It is useless to ask what is the relation of the "goodness" to the Logos: they are different ways of saying the same thing.

† *Quis Rerum Div. Her. Sit.* 60 (*Ma.* i, 516). [(The planets, though they may seem sometimes to obey pagan seers, are under God's control: *Sifre*, *Re'eh*, §84, f. 92*a*, partly in *T.B. San.* 90*a* (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 378)).]

virtue they will not be called upon to do so.* There is again a reminiscence of the *Timaeus*, but it is still more interesting to note that we have here a clear case of the incorporation of a pagan source; for the visible gods, who may sound peculiar, represent not a tendency to syncretism but clumsy scissors-and-paste-work. Of this we find other instances; for instance, we are told that while some philosophers compare the hebdomad to the motherless virgin of victory who sprang fully armed from the head of Zeus, the Pythagoreans equate it with the ruler of the universe.³⁹

But there was a quite different way of explaining the facts. There were rebel angels, and it was possible that the erratic movement of the planets was due to the fact that they were rebels.† The planets were gods in the pantheon of Babylon, and it was easy to identify them with the rebel angels, while, according to another view, the rebel angels were the rulers of the Gentile nations, appointed to lead them astray.⁴⁰ It must be remembered that there were seventy nations in the world and that there are seventy lesser deities in very ancient Semitic theology.‡ The number may have had originally some planetary significance; in any case it would tend to suggest an association between the planets and the rulers of the nations, since for astral mathematics, no less than for Pythagorean, a nought at the end of a

* *De Mon.* I, 1 (*Ma.* II, 214), cf. *Timaeus* 41b. The planets reappear as "visible gods" in *De Mund. Op.* 7 (*Ma.* I, 6).

† Apparently this was what the seven rebel stars in torment of I Enoch xxi, 4 meant; cf. the wandering stars of Jude 13.

[For the importance of 7 (i.e. 7 gods) in the Ras Shamra texts, see J. W. Jack, *O.T. Stud.*, no. 1, 1935, p. 36.]

‡ [For sacrifices offered at Jerusalem for the Seventy Nations on the Feast of Tabernacles, see above, vol. I, p. 149. For 7 (probably) × 70 sacrifices, see Jack, *op. cit.* p. 1.]

figure presents no difficulty. In any case Deut. iv, 19 asserted that God assigned the host of heaven to other nations, while Deut. xxxii, 8 sqq., in the Greek, asserted that the Most High divided their inheritance to the nations according to the number of the sons of God, i.e. the angels.⁴¹ From this point of view, it was possible to arrive at a complete pessimism as to the world order. We find such a pessimism in IV Ezra and II Baruch, where, however, we are dealing with documents written under the immediate influence of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. But we have a striking proof of the length to which these conceptions could go in a Christian document. In Rom. viii, 20 we have an expression of utter pessimism as to this world. The whole creation has been subjected to "vanity" on account of the sin of Adam.⁴² Now "vanity" simply cannot mean a general sense of frustration and incompleteness. It is a bondage of corruption in which the whole of creation groans and travails together; even the Christian does so, though the spirit of God which is in him enables him to endure it with confidence, in hope of his future deliverance into glory.* You cannot call a general sense of incompleteness a "bondage of corruption". Still less does it fit in with Paul's peroration, one of the most magnificent pieces of eloquence in the Bible. "What shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall persecution, or nakedness, or peril, or sword...Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that

* For this passage, cf. (2) IV Ezra. vii, 88 sqq., where the joy of the righteous is described; they see "the straightness and painfulness from which they have been delivered" and the "spacious liberty which awaits them".

loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Now this is a magnificent writing, but what does it mean? It is generally agreed that the rulers of this world who crucified the Lord of Glory in I Cor. ii, 8 are the spiritual lords of evil who dominate the world, not temporal rulers, and no doubt angels and principalities here are the same. But what meaning is there in "things present and things to come and height and depth"? What is the function of these harmless dimensions? The whole passage is meaningless until we recognize that the present position of the stars in their courses determines the future* and that their future positions determine what is to follow after that, that the highest position of a planet in the heaven is the time at which it is most potent for evil, its lowest the position at which it is least potent, and therefore, if a friendly planet, least helpful to defend, while the powers are the powers of heaven, the spiritual forces

* [The following citation is of interest in this connexion: R. Huna related this tale: A proselyte who was an astrologer once wished to go on a journey. "But," he said, "how can I go forth now [for he saw that the hour was unpropitious]?" Then he said, "Since I have joined this holy nation, should I not abandon these practices of mine? Let me then sally forth in God's name." He drew near to a part where there were wild beasts, so he gave them his ass, and they ate it. [So he escaped.] What was the reason of his falling into danger? [His astrological belief in this very danger.] What caused him to be saved? His reliance on his Creator. And so R. Levi said: All those who predict their end by divination reach that end. (*T. J. Sabb.* vi, § 9, f. 8d, line 15 (French trs. S. iv, 79).)]

which guide the celestial bodies; and all the terms used are technical terms of astrology.*

Now Romans is Paul's *apologia* to his own nation, and we may assume that here, as in his Christology, he has been careful to avoid anything that would offend a Jewish Christian. Yet we find a complete astrological scheme. Man, even the Christian, is subject to powers of evil, the lords of the planetary spheres, who are also the principalities and powers which govern the nations. And now we can see what vanity is to which the creation is subject. The Greek substantive *μάταιότης* indeed appears in the Old Testament only in the sense of futility, as notably, of course, in Ecclesiastes; but the adjective with the article is frequently used to translate the various Hebrew nouns for the idols or the false gods of the heathen;† it is interesting to compare the פָּגֵל וְרִיק of the Jewish liturgy.‡ At the same time it is important to note the nature of the deliverance from fate and the powers of the stars which the Christian obtains. In Apuleius, the initiate of Isis is delivered from the malignant assaults of fate in this world.⁴³ Paul knew better; the Christian has no guarantee against persecution and famine and peril and sword, for the lords of the universe had crucified even the Lord of Glory. But they cannot separate him from the only thing that matters, the love of God. We find a similar faith in a later philosophical writing; the

* For the terms cf. Bouche-Leclercq, *L'Astrologie Grecque*, p. 193 (for ὑψώμα and βάθος); for ἐνεργῶτα, Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in British Museum*, I, 100, line 505; μέλλοντα is obvious, but cf. Origen, in *Gen. Comm.* III, 9. For δυνάμεις, cf. Mk. xiii, 25.

† An interesting use of *μάταιος*, as the equivalent of *Hebhel*, in the sense of idols, occurs in Jer. II, 5, καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὅπλων τῶν ματαίων καὶ ἐματαίωθησαν.

‡ See p. 111, *Addenda*.

philosopher is above fate, for he does not delight in the pleasures of the material world, and cannot be injured by it, for he lives in the immaterial.⁴⁴ And we have a hint of the same faith in Rabbinical literature, since we read in *Bereshith Rabba** that Rabbi Levi† represented God as saying to Abraham, "Whosoever is above the stars, he fears them, but thou art above them, tread them down," while R. Judan quotes R. Eliezer at this point for the saying that three things annul the evil decree, prayer, charity and repentance.‡ Similarly in the *Tosefta*⁴⁵ we find an account of the various evils portended by eclipses of the sun and moon; but we are told that when Israel occupy themselves with the study of the Torah they have no need to fear them, "as it is written, Learn not the way of the heathen, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the heathen are dismayed at them" (Jer. x, 2).§

* On Gen. xv, 5; Abraham was taken above the stars that he might look down on them and despise them. *Gen.R.* XLIV, § 12 (Germ. trs. W. p. 204).

† It is not clear whether this is R. Levi ben Sisi (second century) or R. Levi II (third century). Both are Palestinian.

‡ R. Judan is fourth century. The decree is God's, not fate's.

§ [This passage is also] of interest:

"R. Hanina said: 'From the planets depend wisdom and wealth, and there is a planet for Israel.' But R. Johanan said: 'Israel is not subject to the planets [or signs of the Zodiac], for it is said, "Learn not the ways of the nations and tremble not at the signs of the heavens: let the nations tremble at them" (Jer. x, 2). Let the nations tremble; let Israel tremble not.' And Rab agreed with R. Johanan, for R. Jehuda said in Rab's name: 'Whence do we learn that the Israelites are not subject to the planets? Because it says, "And God brought Abraham forth into the open and said, 'Look now towards heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be' (Gen. xv, 5). Abraham said, 'I have seen in astrological books that I am not fit to beget a son'; God replied, 'Come forth out of your astrology; the Israelites are not subject to the planets;

It is clear that the Rabbis quoted would come near to the view that the righteous is superior to fate; it is hardly likely, in view of the experience of Israel, that they would have held that he was free from material dangers rather than spiritual. It is of course open to us to wish that Paul or the Rabbis had been sufficiently modern to realize that astrology is entirely false and that the stars do not determine the fate of man; perhaps some of us may think more highly of the courage of men who saw in persecution not merely the hate of man, but the avenging fury of the lords of evil, yet none the less went their way, secure in the confidence that, though they had no guarantee against persecution and famine and nakedness and peril and sword, yet in all these things, they were more than conquerors, through the love of God.

What is the importance of this contact between the Judaism of the Hellenistic age and Greek thought? We may ask the question with reference either to the influence of Judaism on the Gentile world or the influence of the Gentile world on Judaism. In regard to the first issue we have no materials for an adequate answer. We know that there was a widespread tendency towards that kind of religion which we can describe as "ethical monotheism". It is clear from the history of early Christianity that the synagogues of the Dispersion were attracting a considerable number of proselytes or less definite adherents among the Gentiles. It cannot be doubted that Judaism provided a good many you think that, because Jupiter is in the west; I will turn him round and make him stand in the east, even as it is written, "Who has raised up Jupiter from the east?" (Isa. xli, 2). The word "righteousness", Zedek, means also Jupiter. (T.B. Sab. 156a fin. (Germ. trs. G. 1, 715).)]

Gentiles with a religion that would satisfy their needs. How far the influence of Judaism extended beyond the Synagogue and contributed to the growth of belief in the unity of God and in the development of a higher ethical standard it is scarcely possible to say. The constant preaching of Judaism must have had some effect; but the exclusiveness of Judaism, while it preserved Judaism from absorption into the general religious amalgam of the Hellenistic age, probably limited its power of influencing the general development of Gentile thought outside the limits of the Synagogue.*

There is, however, one direction in which the influence of Hellenistic Judaism has left its traces. The body of late Hellenistic philosophy contained in the *Corpus Hermeticum* is usually admitted to show definite traces of Jewish influence; it seems highly probable that the first Tract, the *Pomandres*, is still trying to read Genesis and the *Timaeus* into one another, with a good deal of material drawn from other apparently incompatible sources. It seems that Philo, or the school of which he is a representative, played a considerable part in the philosophy of Alexandria; but it also would seem that the chief influence was exercised by those who went further than Philo in the direction of unorthodoxy.† A few traces of a similar influence appear.

* For an instance of the difficulty cf. Roberts, Skeat and Nock, *loc. cit.* pp. 65 sqq. It is probable that the circles which provided Judaism with proselytes were more interested in religion than in philosophy: while the temper of the convert is not as a rule calculated to increase his influence on his unconverted neighbours.

† C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, contains an exhaustive study of the possible influence of the LXX and the Judaism of Alexandria as represented by Philo on the cosmogony of the *Hermetica*; there is an excellent summary on p. 243 with which

in other quarters. We have the tantalizing statement of Philo of Byblos that Iao, the usual Hellenistic form of the tetragrammaton, means "intelligible light";* yet another statement that it means invisible.† We are here in the tradition which runs from orthodox Judaism through Philo into the *Hermetica* and Gnosticism of the Valentinian type; and we have yet another glimpse in the oracle of Apollo of Claros that Iao is the highest of all the gods; he is also apparently identical with the sun.‡ It would seem that there was a definite influence of the allegorized cosmogony of Genesis on this tradition of pagan philosophy; but here we are stopped short by the great problem of Christian origins, the early history of the Church of Alexandria, which (apart from the contemptuous notice of Hadrian) appears suddenly in the second century A.D., in the full enjoyment of the tradition of Alexandrine Jewish philosophy as taken over by Valentinus. Soon afterwards Clement and Origen take the place of Philo and Alexandrine Judaism disappears from our knowledge.

We have, however, a few hints that the contact between orthodox Judaism and this type of speculation was once a good deal closer than the literature of Rabbinical Judaism might lead us to suppose. There is,

I entirely agree, while reserving my right to quarrel on a number of details. The book is a model of the method of treatment of such a subject. See further, Nock in *Gnomon*, 1936, p. 607, who holds that unorthodox Judaism was of considerable importance, especially after the destruction of Jerusalem.

* "Herennius", apparently Philo of Byblos *ap.* Lydus, *De Mensibus*, ed. Wünsch, iv, 52 (pp. 111-12).

† Wutz, *Onomasticon*, p. 124.

‡ Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, i, 18. The context suggests that we are in the Stoic-Orphic tradition noted above, p. 80; but this is one of the streams that run through Philo into the *Hermetica*.

for instance, the curious statement in the Mishnah that the books of **המִירּוֹם** do not render the hands unclean.* It comes from a controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, so that we are dealing with matter that is older than the destruction of the Temple, after which the Sadducees disappear. Now the usual interpretation is that we have a reference to the books of Homeros, or the heretics or to diaries (*γήμερησία*). None of these fits the sense, since “render the hands unclean” is roughly equivalent to “being in the Canon of Scripture”. It has been conjectured that for **המִירּוֹם** we should read **הֵרֶם**, “Hermes”, thus seeing in the passage an allusion to an interest of the Pharisees in “Hermetic” cosmogony of a kind which afterwards became too unorthodox to be compatible with Judaism.† This is not the only evidence in this direction. We have the further statement of the Mishnah that the story of Creation may not be expounded before two auditors only nor the chapter of the Chariot (Ezek. i) before one only.‡ This can be due only to the danger of unorthodoxy or Christianity; and Christianity, though it read the doctrine of the Trinity into Gen. i, was not particularly interested in

* *Yadayim* iv, § 6 (Eng. trs. D. p. 784). See also *Midr. Ps.* i, § 8, f. 5 a and *Talkut Ps.* §§ 613, 678. Kohler in *J.E.* III, 549 and *J.Q.R.* (O.S.), v, 415.

† The existing *corpus* is clearly later, but parts of it or their originals may well be older. In any case “Hermes” as the author of such literature is very much older than our actual *corpus*.

‡ *Hagigah* II, § 1 (Eng. trs. D. p. 213); cf. *Megillah* IV, § 10 (Eng. trs. D. p. 207). I would give a great deal to know why it is that this chapter, the happy hunting-ground of Jewish mysticism of doubtful orthodoxy, is never mentioned by Philo. It may simply be due to the rarity of his allusions to books outside the Pentateuch, but it is hard to understand the failure to notice this passage; is it due to its use by more unorthodox speculators?

Ezekiel. Then again we have the suggestion that the day of the translation of the Old Testament into Greek was as "hard as the day of the Golden Calf",* and again the fragments of cosmogony, equating the creative Wisdom with the Torah, which I have already alluded to. Have we in these odd scraps a memory of a time when the Rabbis deliberately turned their backs on this kind of speculation as leading inevitably to Christianity or Gnosticism and did their best to obliterate the records of it?† There is another problem to which I can only allude. Why are the magical papyri filled with Jewish material? The boundary between magic and religion on the one hand and medicine on the other is not too easy to fix in the first century A.D. "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub" suggests that "magic" was a term of abuse, implying that you disagreed with your opponent, but could not deny that he produced remarkable results. (I am not of course suggesting that the term could ever be used in this sense to-day.) In the case of medicine we have the discussion in the Mishnah,‡ where R. Me'ir allows the carrying of a nail from the gallows of one that is crucified as a means of healing on the Sabbath, while the Sages forbid it as following the "ways of the Amorite". Now the relic of a *βιαθάνατος* is always a potent spell, and this particular charm is about as "magical" as anything can be.§

* *Soferim* i, § 8: but the reason there given is because the version was unsatisfactory.

† How far the *Zohar* represents this tradition, and how far it is compatible with orthodox Judaism is a question I must leave to others.

‡ *Shabbath*, vi, § 10 (Eng. trs. D. p. 106) and cf. *Hullin* iv, § 7 (Eng. trs. D. p. 520).

§ Cf. Preisendanz, *Papp. Gr. Mag.* i, 249, II, 145 and *passim*;

Yet R. Me'ir was an enlightened man of the highest reputation for piety and learning, but he seems to have regarded this as genuine medicine. Similarly Josephus describes an exorcism performed before Vespasian in terms which sound to us intensely "magical" though no doubt effective;* while Origen, the most enlightened of the Fathers, tells us that those concerned with magic know that the Jewish names of God, such as Sabaoth or Adonai, are effective in the proper cases, as are the names of Persian or Egyptian deities in others, and that the names do not have their proper effect when translated into other languages.† The magical papyri

Macbeth, Act iv, Scene 1, "Grease that's sweaten from a murderer's gibbet" shows the continuity of the tradition.

References to the magical value of the remains of a man who has died a violent death occur in Tatian, *Adv. Gr.* xvii, 77 and 80 (Ed. Schwartz, *Texte u. Untersuch.*).

* *Antt.* viii, ch. 2, 5 (46).

† *Cels.* i, 25, v, 45. The form of exorcism in Preisendanz, *op. cit.* iv, 3009 sqq., if the reference to "Jesus the God of the Hebrews" were omitted and one or two minor alterations made, e.g. the curious seal which Solomon laid on the tongue of Jeremiah to make him speak the adjuration of the spirit whether "Ebusean or Pharisean" as well as "of heaven or air", etc., and the confusion of the giants of Genesis with those of the Orphic tradition, which is perhaps not surprising in view of the connexion of the two myths in Philo, *De Gigant.* 13 (*Ma.* i, 270), would be a perfectly orthodox Jewish exorcism, though it is ascribed to "Pibeches", whom I cannot identify; the use of herbs is interesting in view of the appearance of herbs prescribed by Solomon in Josephus. It would, on the other hand, with a slight amplification of the Christian element, be a perfectly good Christian formula; cf. Preisendanz, *op. cit.* iv, 1229 sqq. Both are embedded in the same collection (the Paris papyrus). Origen, *In Matt. Comment. Series*, 110 and Irenaeus, *Haer.* ii, 32, 5, disapprove of exorcism by adjuration as opposed to the use of invocation, or of adjurations as against prayers, but the amulets show that they were in advance of the ordinary Christian (for specimens cf. *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* i, 1795 sqq.). Origen complains that some Christians actually use

contain a good deal of material that seems to have gone down in the world, and magic is bound to be international; the only test of orthodoxy in magic is the pragmatic one. I am inclined to suggest that the Jewish language was peculiarly rich in high-sounding and mysterious names, and that its methods of exorcism, originally entirely orthodox, were unusually effective, and hence were largely borrowed and survived in Hellenistic magic after they had been excluded from orthodox Judaism as savouring of the ways of the Amorite; they survived in the poorer and less educated classes of Jews and Christians for many centuries.

With regard to the influence of Greek thought on Judaism we must make a sharp distinction. For Christianity its importance was incalculable. The apocalyptic message of the disciples of Jesus found in it a frame into which they could fit their teaching. The Greek mind could not believe in an end of the world; only godless atomists like Epicurus and Leucippus believed in such a thing as an end of the world. But the Greeks were profoundly interested in the beginning of things, and the Hellenistic Jews had made Judaism at home in the systems of cosmogony which were generally accepted at the time, so that it was an easy thing for St Paul and his successors to transform the Messianic gospel into a system of cosmogony: and this was a task that would have been necessary in any case. As the late Professor Burkitt once said at his seminar, "If you believed that Jesus had risen from

Jewish forms. The line between exorcising by prayer or command on the one hand and exorcism on the other is rather a thin one.

the dead, you were bound to fit him into your cosmogony somehow."

Nor was this the only service. For Judaism in the Dispersion had already faced the difficulty of fitting a specific historical revelation into the scheme of a philosophy which was primarily concerned with the timeless and eternal. However artificial the allegorizing of Philo may seem to us, it did represent a serious attempt to preserve the main fabric of Judaism as a revelation made by God on the stage of history. The tendency of the second century A.D. to substitute cosmological speculation for historical redemption might have had a far wider measure of success if Judaism had not already paved the way for a religion that united the temporal and the eternal.

So then Christianity owes much to Hellenistic Judaism. How much this philosophy meant to Judaism itself is another matter. It is clear that the last two centuries B.C., when Judaism was in its closest contact with Greek thought, witnessed a great development in the Jewish conception of God. The anthropomorphic national deity of early Hebrew religion was being transformed into the one God of the universe,* omnipresent, omnipotent and perfectly holy. The germs of this change were to be found in the earlier prophets; but how far the completion of the change and its general acceptance were due to contact with the Greeks is another question, and one which I do not feel competent to answer.†

* It is difficult to fix either the *terminus a quo* or the *terminus ad quem* of this transition, which begins with the pre-exilic prophets but is completed only with the establishment of the Rabbinical tradition.

† It should be noted that speculations as to the Logos do not

NOTES
TO CHAPTER II

- ¹ Cf. Cook, *Religion of Ancient Palestine*, p. 108.
- ² *Quod. Det. Pot. Ins.* 31 (*Ma.* I, 213).
- ³ Josephus, *Antt.* xx, ch. v, 2 (100).
- ⁴ *De Migr. Abr.* 16 (*Ma.* I, 450).
- ⁵ *De Conf. Ling.* 2 (*Ma.* I, 405); *De Mon.* I, 7 (*Ma.* II, 220).
- ⁶ *Philebus* 30c.
- ⁷ On this see vol. I, pp. 120-1.
- ⁸ *Gen.R. ad init.*
- ⁹ *T.B. Ber.* 10a (Germ. trs. *G.* I, 34; Eng. trs. *C.* p. 60).
- ¹⁰ *Quis Rerum Div. Her. Sit.* 57 (*Ma.* I, 514). For the later Peripatetics, cf. Cic. *Acad. Post.* I, 26.
- ¹¹ *De Gigant.* 2 (*Ma.* I, 263).
- ¹² E.g. *De Mund. Op.* 43 (*Ma.* I, 30).
- ¹³ Num. XVI, 46.
- ¹⁴ Eusebius, *Prep. Evan.* III, 11, 29.
- ¹⁵ *De Mon.* II, 12 (*Ma.* II, 230).
- ¹⁶ Nock, *Conversion*, pp. 37 sqq.
- ¹⁷ *Quaest. in Gen.* 2 fr. (*Ma.* II, 659).
- ¹⁸ Sc. "and not merely our ancestors": cf. *Pes. x*, §§ 4, 5 (Eng. trs. *D.* pp. 150, 151).
- ¹⁹ *Antt.* III, ch. v, 4 (90).
- ²⁰ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, inscr. 550 and 559, pp. 670 sqq.
- ²¹ Col. II, 16 sqq.
- ²² See above, p. 89.
- ²³ A. Neubauer, *Géogr. de Talmud*, Paris, 1868, p. 315.
- ²⁴ Strabo, XVI, ch. II, 35, p. 761.
- ²⁵ Cumont, *Religions Orientales*, p. 123 (ed. 1929) and note *ad loc.*

imply a sort of unconscious dissatisfaction with Unitarian monotheism and a feeling out towards a Trinitarian monotheism. Judaism abandoned this line of thought when the growth of Christianity made it dangerous to persist in it. It is legitimate for Christians to see in these speculations a preparation for the Gospel, but not to suppose that they represented any sense of incompleteness in Judaism. They would have led nowhere if the disciples of Jesus had not believed that He had risen from the dead.

²⁶ For this latter view, cf. Diogenes the Cynic, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, vi, 63 and *Test. Benj.* viii, ch. iii.

²⁷ *Vita* 2 (10).

²⁸ *Quod. Det. Pot. Ins.* 2 sqq. (*Ma.* i, 191).

²⁹ E.g. *De Posterit. Cain.* 40 (*Ma.* i, 251).

³⁰ *De Cong. Er. Gr.* 23 (*Ma.* i, 537).

³¹ *De Prof.* 11 (*Ma.* i, 555).

³² See, for instance, the fragments in Eusebius, *Prep. Evan.* ix, 16 seq.

³³ *Ib.* ix, 27.

³⁴ See, for instance, Diodorus Siculus, i, 16 sqq.

³⁵ Josephus, *Antt.* ii, ch. ix, 2 (205) and Suetonius, *Vit. Aug.* 94.

³⁶ Eusebius, *Prov. Evan.* ix, 28.

³⁷ E.g. *De Mund. Op.* 39 (*Ma.* i, 28).

³⁸ *De Cher.* 7 (*Ma.* i, 142).

³⁹ *De Mund. Op.* 33 (*Ma.* i, 24).

⁴⁰ *Jubilees* xv, 31.

⁴¹ *Jud.* i, 226.

⁴² Sanday and Headlam, *ad loc.*

⁴³ *Metam.* xi, 15, 783.

⁴⁴ See the Hermetic fragment from Zosimus i, 5 (ed. Scott, fr. 20, vol. i, p. 540).

⁴⁵ *Tos. Suk.* ii, 6 (*Z.* p. 194, line 21).

ADDENDA

P. 75. [For נִמְלָה as an imitation, show or phantasy, as opposed to reality, see 'Eduyoth, v, § 6 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 432).]

P. 86 §, end. [It is remarkable that in the Tables in Moses' hand, on the Frontispiece to vol. i, the *Shema'* and the Decalogue are combined.]

P. 87, end of footnote. [See also the Hebr. Enc. 'Osar Yisra'el, viii, pp. 158–68: I have been unable to consult (J.?) Guttmann's *Šefer Behinath Kiyum ham-Mišwoth*, where, I understand, the question is exhaustively treated.]

P. 89*. [See Löw, i, 28; *J.E.* iii, 329. See also Cagnat and Laffaye, *Inscr. Gr. ad res Rom. pertin.* Paris, 1911, vol. i, p. 353, no. 1024.]

P. 100. [The phrase will be found in *P.B.P.* p. 90 and *P.B.G.* p. 58, line 1. The best trs. is in *P.B.P.* The Ashkenazic version (*P.B.S.* p. 75) omits the sentence altogether because the Censors held that it might be taken to refer to the Church! See *P.B.A.* p. LXXXVI; *C.H.B.* pp. 17, 29, 107, 111; *J.E.* s.v. 'Alenu. The sources are Isa. xxx, 7 (LXX μάταια καὶ κενά) and xlvi, 20.]

CHAPTER III
ROME, PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN
BY
JAMES PARKES

N O T E

In this lecture, the term Pharisaism is used in its more usual meanings, not in the special sense indicated in the Preface p. ix. For although the subject of this lecture includes Pagan as well as Christian Rome, the lecturer is concerned less with the impact of ideas common to Judaism and Christianity on an external Gentile environment than with the mutual influence of the two faiths, now completely distinct. This circumstance is both logical and natural. It would be of interest, but extremely hazardous, in our present state of knowledge, to investigate the influence of "the common elements" on parts of the inhabited world that still remained un-Christian and un-Jewish. But the more important aspects are those on which Dr Parkes has rightly concentrated his attention.

CHAPTER III

ROME, PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN

The period which is surveyed briefly in this essay is that which begins with the foundation of the Christian Church, and ends with the mediaeval ghetto. Its main characteristic is easily given. If we seek in it evidence of conscious mutual influence in any important religious issue between Rabbinic Judaism and Gentile Christianity, we shall be disappointed. There is none. We have rather to deal with a whole mass of minor questions, little straws tossed up on the waters of controversy, trifles of daily life, odd remarks and such like. It would have seemed inconceivable to any Gentile churchman from the second century onwards that the Church could learn anything from Judaism. In fact by the year A.D. 150 Gentile Christians were prepared to exclude from Communion those who still maintained Jewish observances, even if they were otherwise completely orthodox.¹ It would have seemed equally inconceivable to the Rabbinic Jew that he could learn from the Christian Church. Jew and Christian developed side by side but each had, in effect, excommunicated the other. Yet, growing side by side, they could not avoid contacts, and it is with these that we have to do. These contacts, however, were conditioned by the fact that the intellectual and spiritual centres of the two religions were widely separated. The centre of Judaism lay in the east, in the Euphrates Valley, where Christians were few. Europe, the sphere of Christianity, possessed no great Jewish cultural centres until the ninth century,

when such a centre developed in Moslem Spain. There was no cultural centre in a western Christian country until a hundred years later.

The Jews were known to the Graeco-Roman world for three things: their intellectual religion, their exclusive customs, and their monotheistic intransigency. Four Greek writers of the fourth and third centuries B.C. refer to their "philosophical" religion.² One of them, Clearchus of Soli, says simply, "In India, philosophers are called Brahmins; in Syria, Jews." Closer contact, however, brought into clearer relief the intransigency inseparable from a monotheistic religion in an officially polytheistic world, and pagan opinion of the Jews declined. A relic of real respect may, perhaps, exist in Vergil's Messianic Eclogue, and one or two writers were acute enough to see the moral purpose behind Jewish exclusiveness.³ But the majority were irritated by it. Unhappily this majority included most of the officials responsible for the administration of Jewish affairs, and their irritation expressed itself in a continual petty religious persecution, varied by definite anti-Jewish acts. When this conduct not unnaturally led to violent rebellion against the Roman Empire itself, it is natural that irritation should turn to hostility, disgust and contempt.

Tacitus in Book v of his *History* frequently expresses his disgust with the Jews, and when he relates how a number of them died when deported to Sardinia, he adds cynically, *vile damnum*⁴—a cheap loss. He and Juvenal also express their particular horror at the effect on a Roman of conversion to Judaism. "Those who adopt their ways practise the same customs, and their first action is to despise the Gods, reject their country,

and count parents and children dross", says Tacitus.⁵ Juvenal adds that converts are taught "not to show the way to a man unless he is of the same faith; and to the fountain that he asks for, to guide only one who is circumcised".⁶ It should perhaps be added that it is unlikely that even at such a period of bitterness Jewish exclusivism really went as far as Tacitus and Juvenal imply. Both of them posed as old-fashioned Romans, conservative of their traditions, and hostile to every foreign innovation. Their hostility was not confined to the Jews, but included every "eastern" influence, Christian, Syrian or Egyptian.* Their very violence is evidence that the prevailing temper of the Empire was tolerant.

Conversion to Judaism did mean, however, complications, and there were consequently repeated measures, often ignored, to prohibit missionary activities on the part of the Jews of the Empire, and the reinforcement of this prohibition by Constantine is the first law in which we can see the influence of the Christian Church.⁷ From that time onwards it was rigorously enforced, and the penalty for making a convert or accepting conversion was death.†⁸

Judaism, itself, however, remained a *religio licita*⁹ until the time of Justinian, and even then, though actions were taken against Jewish communities which indicated that they had no right to state protection, it is uncertain whether legally Judaism could have been considered a forbidden religion, especially as the

* E.g. *Graeculus esuriens*, Juv. i, iii, 78, and *Iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes*, ibid. 62.

† [For the social position of Jews, their freedom and good relations with Roman officials, see *J.E.* III, 329 (*s.v.* Bosphorus) and Löw, I, 41.]

opposite to *licita* is not "illegal" so much as "unincorporated"—the situation of Christianity during the period preceding Constantine. So far as is known, the only country in which Judaism was actually made illegal was Visigothic Spain, and there it was done in the form of allowing only such Jews to reside in Spain as:

- (a) Had accepted Christian baptism.
- (b) Ate pork.
- (c) Were uncircumcised.
- (d) Did not observe the Sabbath.
- (e) Implicitly believed the Christian faith in their hearts.

It needed the genius of an "Aryan" Visigoth to find in such phrases the description of a Jew.¹⁰

The fact that Judaism was a *religio licita* in the Roman Empire gave to Jewish officials a certain public position. At some period in the century following A.D. 70, a Jewish Patriarchate came into existence, and its authority in religious matters was recognized by the Romans as covering all the Jews within the Empire. The Patriarch himself was recognized as one of the highest officials of the Empire with a title analogous to "Your Grace",¹¹ and the jurisdiction of the Jewish courts in all religious questions was guaranteed.¹² The Sabbath enjoyed official protection, and Jews could not be disturbed on that day.¹³ They were entitled to excommunicate members of their community;¹⁴ and they collected their own taxes.¹⁵ In the fifth century, these privileges were much whittled down, and definite infringements of Jewish religious custom came into existence. Theodosius the Great set the example by forbidding Jews to marry within the degrees of affinity

forbidden to Christians.¹⁶ Theodosius II degraded the Patriarch and subsequently abolished his office.¹⁷ The same Emperor ordered Jews to keep Christian seasons of Fasting.¹⁸ Finally, Justinian undertook to regulate Synagogue services, forbidding what he called *deuterosis*, or interpretation of the Scriptures, and ordering the plain text of the Bible to be read in a language understood by the Congregation.* He also ordered the Jews to excommunicate certain Jewish groups of Sadducaic tendencies.¹⁹ Needless to say, all these Emperors were Christians. The pagan Emperors were uninterested in Judaism as such, save in the short period of the wars of Titus and Hadrian. The latter made circumcision a capital offence.† But this was a purely political action of the Emperor and does not indicate hostility to Judaism as a religion.

To understand the laws which were prompted by the influence of Christian leaders, we must turn from the government to the theologians. What did the Church Fathers know about the religion of their Jewish contemporaries? Curiously enough the answer is: Nothing. For them the words of Paul in controversy with the "Judaizers"‡ had eternal validity as a con-

* Justinian, *Novella* 146, 1, §2. A translation of this *Novella* is given in Appendix II of *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*. No one quite knows what this "interpretation" was. The most probable explanation seems to me to be that it refers to Rabbinical exegesis in general and to the Mishnah (Hebrew "repetition") in particular.

† It is a matter of discussion whether this prohibition preceded or followed the war. See Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, I, 226; Radin, *Jews among Greeks and Romans*, pp. 344 sqq.; and Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, 10th ed. p. 325.

‡ It seems noteworthy that in later centuries activities which offended against the canonical rules but which to us appear to

demnation of the whole religion of Torah, and they considered Judaism to be a religion entirely composed of external rules and ordinances. Thus, in the middle of the second century, Justin puts into the mouth of a Jew the following definition of his faith: "To keep the Sabbath, to be circumcised, to observe months, and to be washed if you touch anything prohibited by Moses, or after sexual intercourse."²⁰ Epiphanius, a bishop of the fourth century, and said to be a convert from Judaism, wrote an immense work on all the heresies. He included not only Greek philosophy, but also all forms of Judaism under this heading. He described seven Jewish heresies: Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Nazareans, Ossenes, and Herodians.* Of the Sadducees he says nothing new. The scribes are *deuterotai*,† looking for "some kind of grammatical meaning" in the Law; and they have four archiscribes, Moses, Akiba, Annanus called Judas, and the four sons of Assamonaeus. In the last five he is clearly referring to Judas Maccabaeus and his four brothers. But Epiphanius alone knows what he meant by calling the Maccabees "archiscribes". Possibly he has mixed up "Judas Maccabaeus" with the Patriarch "Judah the Prince", the redactor of the Mishnah, and the brothers of the former with the grandson of the latter, Judah II, also a Patriarch.

lie outside the sphere of religion were stigmatized as "judaizare": St Bernard of Clairvaux, in his Letter to the Clergy and the People of Eastern France, 1146 (*Recueil des Historiens de France*, xv, 605–6) applies the term to the practices of Christian usurers.

* Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses*, P.G. xli. The Samaritan Heresies are Nos. ix–xiii, the Jewish Nos. xiv–xx, the Nazarenes No. xxix, the Ebionites No. xxx, and the Sampseans No. lxxii.

† [This looks like a literal translation of *Mashnim*, Mishnah-teachers. See above, p. 119.]

The Pharisees are like the Scribes but more severe. They are ascetics, believing in rigid discipline and fasting. They believe in the Resurrection and in angels. They are also astrologers, and believe in deterministic fate, which Epiphanius finds inconsistent with ideas of free will, sin and judgement.

The Hemerobaptists, like the Sadducees, deny the Resurrection; otherwise, they hold the views of Scribes and Pharisees, adding thereto daily washing.

The Nazareans come from the north-east of Palestine. They keep the Law but do not believe in the stars or fate. They will eat no meat and refuse those parts of the Bible approving such customs.

The Ossenes, "hypocrites in their habits and dreadful in their intelligence", are Gnostics who "detest virginity and damn continence". They allow apostasy during persecution. They recognize Christ as a great king, eat no meat, and of Jewish customs retain only the Sabbath and circumcision.

The Herodians, who believe that Herod was Christ, are "real Jews, lazy and hypocritical".

One cannot believe that, as a Jew, Epiphanius had been profoundly versed in his religion. Jerome, though not a Jew, was in closer contact with them, and his verdict on the post-biblical developments of Rabbinic Judaism is based on some knowledge of what the Rabbis were doing. Knowledge and approval, however, are two different things, and all Jerome can find to say of the work of the Talmudists is to call them "Interpreters who delude the people with the most terrible traditions, labour night and day to deceive the simple, and cause men to sin about the Word of God, so that they deny Christ to be the Son of God".²¹

In view of this complete rejection of the religious development of Rabbinic Judaism, it is a matter of only secondary interest that we do find in Patristic writings a fair amount of evidence that the authors were familiar with some of the Jewish interpretations of the Scriptures. Jerome gives many such interpretations in his commentaries, and so do others whose knowledge of Hebrew was less than Jerome's or non-existent. At times we find Christians actually going to Jewish scholars for the explanation of verses which they did not understand.* But in canons, laws and writings alike they have nothing but condemnation for the work of the Rabbis.

This does not mean that the Christian kept to the plain meaning of the Bible, while the Jew explained it away, as Patristic writers would have us believe. But the reasons for which Jew and Christian went to the Old Testament were so completely different, that the work of either was of no interest, and could be no help, to the other. The Jew was perpetually preoccupied with the making of the prescriptions of Torah into a basis for daily life. The Christian was seeking proofs of doctrinal points. Each was interpretation, each, to some extent, moralizing, but the Christian rejected the basis on which the Jew worked, that the Law was still valid, and the Jew rejected the purpose for which the Christian worked, the proof that Jesus was Messiah.

As this point is of capital importance for understanding not only the separation of Christianity from Judaism, but also, how it was possible for the two

* Cf. the warnings against Jewish interpretations in the preface to Gregory of Nyssa's *Catechetical Address*, and Jerome, *Contra Rufinum*, II, 28.

faiths to continue to live in continual contact with so little mutual influence, it will be well to develop it at some length. The period of separation coincided with the period in which the control of the Church passed largely into Gentile hands. Doubtless the war with Rome, and the preoccupation of the bulk of the Jewish nation, had something to do with it, although most of the Pharisees, like the Judaeo-Christians, took no part in the struggle, and withdrew from the city before the beginning of the full siege. But a still larger measure of responsibility lies in the development of Christian doctrine among the Gentiles during this period.

It was from the Jews that the Gentile Christians took over the idea of a sacred book of divine origin, whose words could be used to prove questions of the highest importance. Unfortunately, they did not take over undisputed possession of the book itself, which became thus the chief treasure of two religions in conflict with each other, and was used by each to prove the error of the other. Needless to say, when it came to actual elucidation of the text, the Jew was generally right, and the Christian, who knew it only in an imperfect translation, wrong. The result was that the Christian continually accused the Jews of falsifying the text,²² and only a few Christians took the line of Jerome of learning Hebrew themselves in order to be able the better to understand it.

In this conflict, as in every ecclesiastical conflict, whether it has ultimately led to schism or not, the initiative was taken by the innovators. It is not until a group seeking change challenges the established order in essentials that the established order bestirs itself to reply. In this particular conflict, there were

three points which the Bible was adduced to prove by the innovators.

They were Gentiles who did not observe the Law: to justify this they had to prove that the Law had been entirely superseded.

They were Gentiles who wished to claim the Promises scattered through the pages of the Old Testament: to make good their claim they had to prove that the people to whom those promises were made had forfeited them.

They were Gentiles who accepted Jesus of Nazareth as Messiah and God: to convince others of this they had to prove that His Messianic claim, and the Doctrine of the Trinity which grew out of it, could be established from the Old Testament.

The methods which they adopted to prove these points made reconciliation impossible. It could be no question of degree or of compromise. The questions were fundamental, and the interpretations diametrically opposed to each other. It was not a case of a balance of probability, or of both sides being half right and able gradually to move together, as has so often happened in subsequent biblical controversies. For to each of their claims there was a counterpart.

If the Law had been superseded, the observance of it was not a neutral matter but a sin.

If the promises belonged to the Church, then the curses of the Scriptures belonged to the Jews.*

* [A striking instance is the adoption, by Christians, of the term "The Third Generation" or "The Third Class", *בָּתְ שְׁלִישִׁית* (Bat Shlishit), those "Saved". See L. Baeck, "Das Dritte Geschlecht", in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, New York, 1935, pp. 40 sqq.: this is a most valuable study of an interesting phrase and its transfer to Christianity.]

If Jesus was the Messiah, then the Jews were further accursed as a deicide race.

When we consider the first two points, we must also remember that they were made just at the time of the tragedy of the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Law and the Promises were all that was left to the Jews after the loss of their country and their Temple.

Authority for stating that the Law had been abolished Christians found in their interpretation of the Epistles of St Paul. It is not possible here to enter into the question in detail, and it must suffice to state that there are reasons for believing that they had seriously misunderstood him. Paul certainly considered the ceremonial law unnecessary for the Gentiles, and the Council of Jerusalem supported him. But this is not to say that he favoured the abolition of the whole religion of Torah, which had been the religion of Jesus, and was the religion of Paul himself. Paul certainly considered that the Law had its fulfilment in Jesus, and that in Jesus man had power. But fulfilment is not supersession; and the good life which man had the power to live "in Christ"—the phrase occurs 240 times in Paul's Epistles—was the good life of Pharisaic Judaism. But the Gentiles came to identify fulfilment with supersession; and thought of "power" more in the terms of "salvation" than of moral living. Thus they held that the whole fabric of "Torah" was done away with in the coming of Christ, whatever its previous validity. From this, it was an easy transition to depose the Law, or at least the Jewish understanding of it, from its high position before the Incarnation. Many explanations of Old Testament history were offered.

Some suggest that the whole Law was meant to be interpreted allegorically (e.g. Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle to Diognetus); others that it was a concession to Jewish materialistic propensities (e.g. Irenaeus; Maimonides explained sacrifices in the same way)*; others concentrated on the Jewish failure to observe it (e.g. Hilary); and finally Jerome, at one point at least, claims that God sent the Jews the Law in order to deceive them.²³ While such views were held, there was no common ground for discussion between Jews and Christians.†

The same is true of the Promises. The Old Testament records the history of a single people, their heroes and villains, their successes and failures. It is full of glorious promise and dark denunciation, high praise and dire threat. So long as one people retains both sides, there is a balance. Now came the Church and claimed all the heroes, the promises and the praise. Even that would have been less fatal had it not, on the other hand, explicitly allotted to the Jews the villains, the denunciations and the threats. The heroes of the Old Testament

* Cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* iv, 15, § 1; Origen, *c. Cels.* ii, 74; *Didascalia Apostol.* vi, 16, § 6, where, after the Golden Calf, "iratus est Dominus et in furore irae suae cum misericordia bonitatis suae alligavit eos in secundatione legis et obstrictione oneris et in duritia catenae".

For Maimonides, cf. A. Cohen, *The Teachings of Maimonides*, London, 1927, pp. 178 sqq.

† [One of the Jewish arguments against the claim of the Christians to be the true Israel, because of the possession of the Torah, was to maintain that the Jews had the spirit, while the Christians had the letter, or, as they put it, the Christians had only the *Torah sheb-bikethab*, the "Written Law". The Jews had the Oral Law, which was God's *μυστήριον*. This differentiated them from the nations (*sc.* Christians, no doubt). See *Tanh.*, vay-Yera, § 5, f. 33a (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 118).]

were considered “pre-Incarriage Christians”.* In the Eastern Churches all of them will be found, each with his own day.† Eusebius anticipated National Socialist

* An amusing example of this is to be found in an Arabic *History of the Patriarchs*. When the Jews failed to rebuild the Temple during the reign of Julian, they were told that their failure was due to the presence of the bones of “the Christians” still buried on the site. They therefore dug up—and threw out—the bones of Elijah and John the Baptist (*Patrologia Orientalis*, I, 419).

[Ideas of a pre-Incarriage Church can be paralleled in Judaism, possibly as an answer to the Christian claims. An obvious example—which is by no means unique—may be seen in the Jewish Liturgy, in the ‘*Amidah* for Sabbath afternoons, where it is said that the Patriarchs kept the Sabbath (see the section beginning “Thou art One”, *P.B.S.* p. 175, in latest ed. 175e). It is true that the Sabbath was ordained at the Creation, but the Patriarchs are sometimes said to have kept the whole Law by anticipation. This was only a Midrashic idea but it may well have arisen in consequence of Christian arguments against the eternal validity of the Law. Sources are given by Abrahams, in his note on p. clxx. The Christian contention was that Adam and the Patriarchs did not keep the Sabbath, yet they were saved, hence the Sabbath is not essential for salvation. The reference to Abraham and Sabbath is interesting: it may have been a Jewish reply to “The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham” (*Galat.* III, 8).]

It is interesting to note that this point is brought out and argued—both ways—by Christians in the seventeenth century, during the Sabbatarian controversies: see below, p. 281.

In Jubilees this idea is prominent. Noah and his descendants, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, keep the Feast of Weeks (vi, 18–19; xv, 1; xxii, 1; xliv, 4). Abraham kept Tabernacles (xvi, 20 sqq.) and, probably, Passover (xviii, 18, in *Nissan*). Jacob kept Tabernacles (xxxii, 4) and ‘*Asereth* (ib., 27: see vol. I, p. 131, note 4).

The question has been admirably discussed by Ch. Albeck, in his *Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* (*Beilage z. Jahresber. d. Hochschule f. d. Wiss. d. Jud.*, Berlin, 1930), pp. 4 sqq.

In certain respects a parallel may be drawn with Muhammad’s claim to restore the pure religion of Abraham, see below, p. 158.

† The following, for example, will be found in the *Acta Sanctorum*: Abraham, 16 March; Moses, 4 Sept.; Joshua and Gideon, 1 Sept.; Samuel, 20 Aug.; Elijah, 20 July, etc. Compare also the

Germany by ascribing them to a different race from the rest of the Jews.²⁴ They were "Hebrews" who had always lived by faith and not the Law. The resultant history of the Jews can be given in the summary of an anonymous writer of the fourth century:

Moses they cursed because he proclaimed Christ,
 Dathan they loved because he did not proclaim Him;
 Aaron they rejected because he offered the image of Christ,
 Abiram they set up because he opposed Him;
 David they hated because he sang of Christ,
 Saul they magnified because he did not speak of Him;
 Samuel they cast out because he spoke of Christ,
 Ham they served because he said nothing of Christ;
 Jeremiah they stoned while he was hymning Christ,
 Ananias they loved while he was opposing Him;
 Isaiah they sawed asunder shouting His glories,
 Manasseh they glorified persecuting Him;
 John they slew revealing Christ,
 Zechariah they slaughtered loving Christ,
 Judas they loved betraying Him.²⁵

Not only did the Church present such a picture of the past history of the Jews, but it revelled in painting gloomy pictures of their present misery, and delighted to point out that there was no hope of restoration.*²⁶ Even those who held that at the end "all Israel shall be gathered in", such as Jerome, also gloated over their present misfortunes.²⁷ The continual remarks of

Jacobite Synaxary on the Maccabean Martyrs, *Patrologia Orientalis*, XVII, 712.

* [In art, this thought sometimes found expression in the theme "Church and Synagogue"; see Frontispiece and the descriptive note *ib.*, pp. xxi-xxii.]

John Chrysostom in his six Sermons against the Jews are so repulsive that even the reading of them produces a feeling of nausea.

The third use of the Old Testament was to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, and to this end there are an enormous series of writings called by such titles as *Adversus Judaeos* or *Disputatio cum Judaean*. These writings all have one feature in common. They desire to prove that Jesus is Messiah and God. They are not concerned with showing that He was an attractive character, and scarcely, if ever, refer to the beauty of His teaching. Their approach is entirely intellectual and metaphysical. It is the easier to understand the lack of appeal which this teaching made upon Rabbinic Jews, when we realize two points, of particular importance in the period in which Christianity was still a Jewish sect, and religious contacts between Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah and those who did not still existed. First, there is in all the theology of the time a strong element of Subordinationism,* and it is present in all the books of the New Testament. And since this Subordinationism is carried back into the pre-Incarnation Christ, it does in fact deny the unity of God. It does make of Jesus a demi-God, an inferior Deity, at the same time as His equality with the Father is stated. Secondly, the method used was far-fetched Midrash from the Old Testament. The Jews used Midrash, just as far-fetched as the Christian, but for an essentially different purpose. It was to illustrate an accepted truth.† It was not used to *prove* doctrinal

* I.e. the doctrine that both before the Incarnation and after the Resurrection the Son was subordinate to the Father.

† Cf. the common expression **אין מקרה יוצא מידי פשוטו**

truths otherwise not admitted. The Christians used such statements as "Let us make man in our own image", to *prove* the Trinity;* Ezekiel's Gate, which was shut, to *prove* the Virgin Birth; Daniel's stone, which was not touched with hands, for the same purpose, and so on.²⁸ None of these would have been recognized as proofs by Jewish hearers, and when it was coupled with the usual epithets in which these writings address Jews—dogs loving their vomit, murderers, serpents, adulterers, Sodomites, cannibals, idolators, deicides, and such like—it is not surprising that such teaching provided no basis for mutual influence or respect.

The Jewish retort to this triple attack also allowed of little mutual understanding. That they should refuse to accept the Christian interpretation of the value of the Law and the destination of the Promises was natural, and when it came to straight biblical interpretation they generally had the better of it. The vital issue was, however, the Messianic, and here the Jewish reply was fourfold. The Jews denied first that God could have a son; secondly, that a man could be divine, especially

(*T.B. Yeb.* 11b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 29)), "A Bible text can never lose its literal sense" (although its meaning may be extended by methods of interpretation: so Jastrow): cf. also **מִקְרָא וּזְמַנְתָּו** (*Ndrsh* (*T.B. San.* 101a (Germ. trs. *G.* viii, 444))), "This verse must be interpreted by its own wording."]

* [The Rabbis were "heckled" by *Minim* about this verse, which afforded them an "opening of mouth", or opportunity for inconvenient questions. See *Gen.R.* viii, § 9 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 33, Th. p. 62; his note should be studied). Who were these *Minim*? Were they Jewish Christians, Gnostics or Pagans? The question, and the passage, is the subject of a detailed discussion by Travers Herford (*Christ. in Talm. and Midr.* London, 1903, pp. 255 sqq.), who holds that in this case the *Minim* were "Jewish Christians" "holding a theology similar to that of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*" (*ib.* p. 266).]

one who had died a death accursed by the Law; thirdly, that there was any evidence in the Scriptures that God was a Trinity.²⁹ Fourthly, he denied that the character of Jesus of Nazareth was such as to warrant the high claims made for him by the Christians. It is the last point which is the more important for us in understanding the completeness of the gulf between Jew and Christian in the centuries under review.

At the end of the first century, a letter was sent out from Palestine to the synagogues of the Diaspora warning them against this new Messianic heresy.* We do not know the contents of the letter, but it almost certainly contained a statement about the life and character of Jesus considered adequate to disprove the claim that he was Messiah. It is unlikely that the letter itself indulged in any slanderous or repulsive picture. Such would not have suited the circumstances. But, the separation once achieved, a rival life of Jesus was naturally circulated for the benefit of Jewish readers, a life which followed sufficiently closely the Christian stories for it to provide an alternative explanation of the Christian claims.† Jeshu is presented as an illegiti-

* Referred to by Justin (*Trypho* 108), Origen (*Contra Celsum* vi, 27), Eusebius (on Isa. xviii, 1), Jerome (on Isa. xviii, 2). The so-called "Letter of Jochanan ben Zakkai" is a "forgery" in the sense that it was written as a polemic against the Frankists, a semi-Christian Polish sect in the eighteenth century: this has been shown by A. Marmorstein in *The Jewish Guardian* of 25 July 1930.

† The best studies of the Jewish Lives of Christ are: S. Krauss, *Das Leben Jesu nach jüdischen Quellen*, and J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Part I, ch. I. I am indebted to Mr Hugh Schonfield for the suggestion which, I think, he will be able to establish in a forthcoming book, that the *Toledoth Yeshu* was in origin a parody on and a reply to the Gospel of the Hebrews. While thus the complete texts which we possess are mediaeval, they would derive from a complete, though more moderate, original of early date.

mate child, who went to Egypt, learnt magic, and came back and gathered around himself a group of robbers and charlatans. He was finally executed, after the most careful enquiry whether he merited pardon. His body was swept away by the bursting of an aqueduct and never found. This is a summary of what existed in many forms and versions.

There was also a Jewish retort to the miracles which leaves traces in various lives of the saints and elsewhere. When Donatus of Istria preached so effective a sermon on the raising of Lazarus that seven philosophers, eleven lawyers, and two hundred and eighty-two others were converted, only the Jews remained sceptical. Challenged as to their reason for scepticism, they replied that the miracle was, doubtless, a good one, but it could not compare with that of Elisha, whose *dead bones* were enough to raise a man to life.³⁰ Again, when Romanus was about to be burnt at Antioch, the Lord sent a miraculous storm lest any Jew present might compare the death of the martyr unfavourably with the safety of the Three Holy Children.³¹

There was, however, Jewish material which more directly, and one may say, more intelligently, criticized the Gospel narrative. A Genizah fragment gives the following points:

- (i) The attitude of Jesus to His parents was not that of a perfect man.
- (ii) If He was perfect, why did His parents not believe in Him?
- (iii) He fasted and was tempted by the Devil.
- (iv) He was known in Nazareth as an ordinary man.³²

The speech of the High Priest in the "Hebrew Gospel

of Matthew" gives further points from the Jewish polemic:

- (i) The preaching and miracles of Jesus were inferior to those of the prophets, but the latter did not
 - (a) preach a New Law,
 - (b) speak in their own name,
 - (c) call themselves God.
- (ii) Jesus did everything for ostentation, and blindly abused everyone who disagreed with him.³³

Such views spread gradually throughout the whole Jewish community, and armed them everywhere against Christian propaganda. It is only on very rare occasions that we get genuine evidence of a Jew having himself read the Gospels and having been impressed by the portrait of Jesus which he found in them. One such example is found in a Coptic *History of the Patriarchs*, and the Jew concerned, when asked why he does not therefore become a Christian, gives several reasons, one that Jesus is already respected among the Jews, another that the lives of Christians offer nothing to attract him; and a third, that he could hardly expect his Christian friends to see him come to the font when the Christians had a proverb that to baptise a Jew was equal to christening an ass.³⁴

Thus, so far from leading to common understanding, the presence of each led the other only to redouble his efforts to warn his fellows against a pernicious influence. The Jew took care in the translations of his Bible (*Targumim*) to allow no words to slip in which could support the Christian doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. And the Christian made use of the secular arm to supplement his continual warnings against Jewish influence. Laws of the Roman Empire, canons

of Church Councils, sermons and tracts were all directed to this end. The position of catechumens was regarded as especially delicate, and there are warnings that during this period care must be taken to give the neophyte arguments against the interpretations of the Bible with which Jews might try to estrange him.³⁵ Servants and slaves, in view of their ignorance, were also considered to be in a dangerous position, and many of the prohibitions of Jewish ownership of Christian slaves give as motive that the religion of the slave might be destroyed by the Jewish master.³⁶

The orthodox theologians of either side thus owed nothing consciously to those of the other; but there are two examples within our period of temporary influence, one in either direction. It is not surprising that in the century immediately following the shocks of the destruction, first of the Temple, then of the city of Jerusalem, the ordinary Jew should have felt bewildered and, without losing his loyalty to his own faith, should yet have cast longing eyes at the Christ so triumphantly preached by the Church as the source and seal of the remission of sins. Origen (182–250) tells us that Jews had come to him and told him that “since they had no altar, no temple, no priest, and therefore no offering of sacrifices, their sins remained with them, and they had no hope of obtaining pardon”.³⁷ The result was the evolution in third-century Rabbinic preaching of novel doctrines of forgiveness. The sacrifice of Isaac was made considerable use of—and this may be the reason why it is so rarely referred to in Christian polemics as a “type” of the sacrifice of Christ. Others found a sacrifice in the blood of circumcision. Others said that Elijah continually offered

prayers in heaven for the forgiveness of the sins of his people. Finally, the idea that repentance and prayer were themselves creative of forgiveness came to be the accepted doctrine, and the subject slipped into the background. It is interesting to note that Isaac is also spoken of as a "Mediator" for his obedience, and this thought occurs frequently in the New Year Service. A third-century Palestinian Rabbi, Johanan, makes Abraham say "when the descendants of Isaac are guilty of transgressions and evil actions, remember the sacrifice of Isaac and have pity".*

The Christian case appeared some centuries later. The Christians of the eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire of the eighth century were neighbours to two religions, both of which absolutely condemned the use of images of any kind in worship: Judaism and Islam. In Eastern Christianity, even more than in Western, images had come to assume an excessive role, especially among the monks and ignorant—one might say other

* [Gen.R. lvi, 10 (see also 9) (Germ. trs. W. p. 270). See also P.B.S., end of first paragraph on p. 252, and P.B.A. p. cxcix.

See also *Tanh.* end of vay-Yera, 40a (Germ. trs. Sin. p. 147). The following is a typical passage:

"Abraham prayed unto God, and said, 'Thou knowest that when thou didst say unto me, "Take now thine only son Isaac and offer him for a burnt offering," it was in my heart what to answer, namely, "Yesterday thou didst say to me, 'In Isaac shall thy seed be called, and to-day thou biddest me offer him up as a burnt offering.'" But though I could have answered thus, I suppressed my inclination, and did not do so, as it is said, "As a dumb man, who opens not his mouth" (Ps. xxxviii, 13). If then Isaac's descendants fall into sin and evil deeds, do thou make mention of the binding of Isaac, and get up from the throne of judgment, and sit down upon the throne of compassion, and be filled with pity, and turn the attribute of judgment into the attribute of mercy.'" (*Lev.R.*, 'Emor, xxix, 9 (Germ. trs. W. p. 204).) See also Rashi on Gen. xxii, 14.]

ignorant—people. The use made of images seemed not unnaturally to Jews and Mohammedans to be pure idolatry, polytheism and paganism. The gibes and sarcasm to which intelligent Christians in those parts had to submit resulted in a movement for the abolition of images in Christian worship also. Hence the great Iconoclastic controversy, ushered in by an emperor who came himself from the eastern provinces. While less is heard of the role of Islam in provoking the controversy, those who wished to cling to images had no doubts about the responsibility of the Jews. This they embodied in a story of a Jewish fortune-teller meeting the future emperor while he was yet a simple Isaurian shepherd. The Jew hailed him as emperor. The shepherd laughed. "If I come to you in your palace in Constantinople in three years will you give me whatever I ask?" said the fortune-teller. "Certainly", said the shepherd. Three years later the Jew came to the palace and reminded the former shepherd of his promise. "What do you want?", said the emperor. "Destroy all the images of Jesus and the Virgin Mary in the Empire", was the Jew's reply.* Nor is this the only reference to a Jew in the controversy. The Iconodules hit upon a happy idea, and forthwith appeared everywhere in circulation wonderful stories of the conversion of Jews by images.³⁸ The reasoning was very simple. It was useless to deny that an image was an extremely powerful spirit when it was capable of converting a Jew!

While these two cases are interesting for illustrating

* George Hamartolus, Book iv, ccxlviii. [There is a somewhat similar story about Diocletian in *Gen.R.* LXIII, 8 (Germ. trs. W. p. 299). See also *J.E. s.v. Diocletian.*]

the effects of Judaism and Christianity upon each other, it is worth noting that in neither case did the influence lead to any real modification of the religion in question. Judaism rejected the idea of producing a Mediator to ensure forgiveness, and the Church continued to make use of images.

I do not know of any similar examples where such direct reactions can be discovered, but this does not exhaust the subject. Catholic Christians and Rabbinic Jews were never the only religious bodies during the period under review. Every kind of "heresy" existed, making an almost continuous bridge from the one faith to the other. Moreover, the interests of the man in the street were not necessarily those of the theologian, and, finally, we need to consider, and make some estimate of the more intangible influences, resulting from actual geographical contact with Jewish communities, on the new civilization of western Europe whose motive forces were a Jewish Bible and a Jewish Messiah.

It is a little difficult to be sure always that Jewish influences are present where a heresy is called "Judaizing", for the term, especially in the East, came to be a simple term of abuse, at any rate by the time of the Nestorian controversy.* There is a pleasant story of seventh-century Egypt which brings this out. The emir asked in turn the bishops of the Melkites, Gaianites, Barsanuphians and Jacobites, all sects holding firmly to the Divinity of Christ, which of the other sects most resembled his own. Each replied "the Jacobites", but when he asked the worthy Simon Bishop of the Jacobites the same question, he dismissed all the others,

* See above, p. 119, ‡, and below, p. 273.

and excommunicated them as a pack of Jews.³⁹ The term "Judaizing" is, therefore, no evidence in itself of the presence of Jewish influence. But with this reserve in mind, we can consider two groups of heresies, mostly belonging to the earlier part of the period. There were heresies of Gentiles which rejected either the full Divinity of Christ, or the canonical Scriptures; and there were heresies of Jews who did not accept the Catholic condemnation of the Law.* It is very tempting to see Jewish influence in the persistent refusal of the Arians to accept the full Divinity of Christ, but, while it is true that Arians rarely persecuted Jews, I have not

* As evidence for Jewish-Christian heretics, the following passages may be cited:

(1) Epiphanius, *Contra Haereses*, Lib. i, Tom. ii, Haeresis xxix, 7-9:

The Nazarenes believe in O.T. and N.T. but practise circumcision, keep Sabbaths, observe Jewish ceremonies and doctrines, while believing in Christ (*διὰ τὸ ἔτι νόμῳ πεπηδήσθαι, περιτομῇ τε καὶ Σαββάτῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις*). Jews and Christians alike curse them.

(2) S. Jerome, *Ep. to Augustine*, cxii:

Usque hodie per totas orientis Synagogas inter Judaeos haeresis est quae dicitur Minaeorum et a Pharisais usque nunc damnatur, quos vulgo Nazarenos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum, filium Dei, sed dum volunt esse et Christiani et Judaei nec Judaei sunt nec Christiani. On this see S. Krauss, p. 236 of *J.Q.R.* (O.S.), vol. vi, Jan. 1894.

(3) Augustine, *c. Cresconium* (Donatist), i, 31:

Et nunc sunt quidam haeretici qui se Nazarenos vocant, a nonnullis autem Symmachiani adpellantur, et circumcisionem habent Judaeorum et baptismum Christianorum.

(4) Gregory the Great, *Ep. xiii*, 1 (To the Roman citizens):

A rebuke of the Judaizing habit of keeping the Sabbath. Those who teach this are followers of Antichrist.

(5) Ambrose, *Ep. 74*:

Epistle to "Irenaeus", urging him not to follow Jewish customs and referring, in particular, to Christians who believe it a sin to carry anything on the Sabbath.

been able to find any real trace of such influence. The Gnostic sects certainly owed much to traditions which contained Jewish elements, but these elements were as strongly condemned by Rabbinic Judaism as they were by Catholic Christians. It is not until centuries later that the Jewish mystical writings came to win any acceptance amongst "orthodox" Jews. During the period of the Renaissance these writings exercised an extraordinary fascination over Christian scholars and churchmen, and provided a valuable link between Jewish and Christian thinkers, but this lies outside our period.

It would seem more hopeful to seek for a bridge by which influence passed from Judaism into Christian civilization in the Jewish sects which accepted Jesus as Messiah, or in the individual conversions of Jews to Christianity. But again instead of a bridge we meet a chasm. After the second century, orthodox Jews who accepted the Messianic claims of Jesus were, if they openly admitted it, liable to exclusion from the Synagogue; for these claims had been declared incompatible with Judaism. Nor could they bring a Jewish influence into the Christian Church, for the Church demanded an absolute surrender of their Jewish heritage. If they wished to combine Judaism with Jesus as Messiah they were obliged to form separate groups. The result was that various "heresies" of a "Judaizing" kind lingered on for centuries in Palestine and elsewhere in the East; and some even survive until to-day, but they can exercise no influence on either side. Individual converts were in no better case, for the very fact of their origin caused their belief and conduct to be under continual supervision for any trace of heresy. The Church re-

flected its suspicions in making admission more difficult for Jews than for others.⁴⁰

But if the realm of thought fails to provide certain examples of the influence of Judaism we shall obtain something positive at last in the realm of practice. Jews and Christians had to meet continually in nearly all the towns of the Empire, in the ordinary pursuit of their daily tasks, and by such contacts inevitably learnt something of each others' lives. It is extremely probable that it is from such contacts from below that the Jewish discussions of forgiveness and the Christian iconoclastic controversies arose. Cases which did not involve doctrine are more common. The part played by religion in the practical life of the Jew, the religious benediction and discipline of common occupations, attracted the pagan converts to Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries, when their own religion was still a religion of theology and salvation. Evidences of this come from both East and West. We learn from Chrysostom that in Antioch an oath taken in the Jewish manner was held to have a special sanctity;⁴¹ and at the same period we find in Spain that the blessing of crops by the Rabbi was held to ensure the best harvest.⁴² Even greater was the influence of the Jewish Sabbath, with its rest from work and family gaiety. The Sabbatarians of modern times may owe more to the written word of the Old Testament than to their Jewish neighbours, but it is fairly clear that in neither East nor West was the mere repetition of "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy" enough to explain the movements for special observances on Saturday. To begin with, it is only from the presence of Jews that the ordinary man would have been likely

to realize that the "Sabbath" was distinct from Sunday, since in Christian parlance the two terms were identified. While Sunday was a day of religious observances, absolute freedom from work on the part of an employed man was given only slowly, and with a number of exceptions. Also pleasures were forbidden, where work was forbidden. The Jewish Sabbath stood in sharp contrast to this, as a day of most attractive peace and family pleasure, and simple Christians were naturally drawn to it. Canons had to be issued repeatedly forbidding this treatment of Saturday as a day of rest or of observing Sunday in the Jewish manner.⁴³ But the most curious proof that it was contemporary Jewish practice which led to the behaviour of Christians, is that Saturday was treated as so Jewish a day that some did not even read the New Testament upon it, but confined themselves to the Old.⁴⁴ Akin to this influence is the interest in the Jewish feasts. Even the date of Easter had to be changed to prevent the confusion of it with the Passover, and in spite of the change, many Christians continued to observe both.⁴⁵ Our evidence again comes both from East and West, showing the naturalness of the custom. For it took centuries of canonical threat to prevent even clerics from participating in Jewish feasts, or receiving from their Jewish friends such special tokens of their festivals as the unleavened bread of Passover.⁴⁶

From such small, but concrete, cases we must turn to larger but less certain issues. We know that discussions and controversies between Jewish and Christian scholars took place in every century of Christian history. We have no evidence that either side was ever convinced by the arguments of the other, before the mediaeval

period. The victories claimed depend entirely on which side is reporting the controversy. But we can at least claim this: the discussions themselves must have contributed considerably to the clarification of Christian metaphysics. Wrong-headed as we now consider it, the interpretation of the Old Testament adopted by the Church owed its evolution primarily to this source. Pagans would have been in no condition to force the theologians to search the Scriptures, and if we owe the rather fantastic interpretations of prophecy to defence against the Jews, we probably owe also to the same source the accurate knowledge of the text, which led to many other and more profitable results. As the discussions were always metaphysical, it is useless to look to them or to direct Jewish influence for the development of ideas of charity and mutual responsibility which the Church certainly did not get from her Graeco-Roman background. But the combined presence of such organizations in contemporary Jewish life and the study of the Old Testament may well be responsible for many Christian developments, in conceptions of justice, the treatment of slaves and serfs, education, equality before the law, regard for human life, and so on. But as the passage of influence was certainly unconscious, it is not possible to define the part played in it by the written text, and that which was played by contemporary Jews. In some cases definition is even more difficult, for the Gentile Church itself inevitably took over certain forms of Apostolic Jewish Christianity. Of such inheritances two are obvious: the Christian form of public worship, and the doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures.

Such results of a thousand years of physical contact

are indeed meagre. But mutual influence was ruled out by the form taken by the initiative of the new body and by the response of the old. Apart from small details, and intangible possibilities, a man had to belong entirely to one or the other, and if he would change his faith, he had to do it completely.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER III

¹ Justin, *Tryphon*, cap. 47.

² Theophrastus, Clearchus, Megasthenes, Hermippus. *Textes des Auteurs Grecs et Latins relatifs au Judaïsme*, ed. Reinach, Nos. 5, 7, 8, 14, Paris, 1895.

³ Dion Cassius, *Hist.* xxxvii, 17. Reinach, *op. cit.* No. 99.

⁴ *Annals* II, 85. Reinach, *op. cit.* No. 175.

⁵ *Hist.* v, 5. Mieses, *Ursprung des Judenhasses*, p. 336. *

⁶ Juv. *Sat.* XIV, 100. Reinach, *op. cit.* No. 172.

⁷ *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 1.

⁸ See my *Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, Appendix I, part 2, p. 389.

⁹ *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 9. Law not repeated by Justinian.

¹⁰ *Leg. Vis.* bk. XII, ch. II, law 4; bk. XII, ch. II, law 8.

¹¹ Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain*, I, 391. Paris, 1914.

¹² *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 8 and bk. II, ch. I, law 10.

¹³ *C.T.* bk. VIII, ch. VIII, law 8.

¹⁴ *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 8.

¹⁵ *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 17; cf. bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 14.

¹⁶ *C.J.* bk. I, ch. IX, law 7.

¹⁷ *C.T.* bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 22 and bk. XVI, ch. VIII, law 29.

¹⁸ *C.T.* bk. XV, ch. V, law 5.

¹⁹ Justinian, *Novella*, 146, ch. II.

²⁰ Justin, *Trypho*, 46.

²¹ Commentary on Isa. XXIX, 17. Jerome seems to be referring to the Pharisees.

²² E.g. Origen, *Letter to Africanus*, and Jerome, *Ep. XXXII* (to Marcella).

²³ *Ep. CXXI*, where he quotes Ezek. XX, 25 as applying to Torah.

²⁴ E.g. *Praep. Evan.* VII and X; *Dem. Evan.* I.

²⁵ Pseudo-Cyprian, *Adversus Judaeos*, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, III, III, 135.

²⁶ E.g. Jacob of Serug, *Homilies*, I, line 283.

²⁷ E.g. Commentary on Isa. XLVIII, 20–22; XLIX, I.

²⁸ See the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zachaeus* on Gen. I, 26 (A. Lukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*, p. 119), Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa, *Selected Testimonies from the Old Testament against the Jews*, on Ezek. XLIV, I sqq., and Dan. II, 34 (ib. p. 127).

²⁹ E.g. R. Abbahu of Caesarea, *Jer. Ta'an.* II, § 1, f. 65 b, line 68 on Num. XXIII, 19 (French trs. S. VI, 156); on Isa. XLIV, 6 see *Exod.R.* XXIX, § 5 (Germ. trs. W. p. 209).

³⁰ *Acta Sanctorum*, 22 May, vol. V, 146. The biblical reference is to II Kings XIII, 21.

³¹ Eusebius of Emesa, *Homily on the Resurrection* in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vols. XXX and L.

³² See article by S. Krauss in *R.E.J.* LXIII, 63.

³³ *Acta Sanctorum*, 24 Feb.

³⁴ Arabic *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, *Patrologia Orientalis*, I, 122.

³⁵ E.g. Nilus, *Ep.* 57; *P.G.* LXIX, 108; and Isidore of Pelusium, I, 141; III, 94; IV, 17; *P.G.* LXXXVIII, 276, 797 and 1064.

³⁶ E.g. Orleans IV (541), Canon 31.

³⁷ Homily on Num. X, 2.

³⁸ E.g. Combefis, "De maximo miraculo", in *Historia Haeresis Monothelitarum*, Paris, 1648, John of Nikious, ch. xcI, etc.

³⁹ *History of the Patriarchs*, I, xvi; Simon I, *Patrologia Orientalis*, V, 35.

⁴⁰ Cf. the professions of faith extracted from Jews on baptism, p. 304 and Appendix III of *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*.

⁴¹ Chrysostom, *Sermon against the Jews*, I, 3.

⁴² Elvira, Canon 49.

⁴³ E.g. Laodicea, *Canon* 29; Agde, *Canon* 12.

⁴⁴ Laodicea, *Canons* 16 and 29.

⁴⁵ E.g. Antioch, *Canon* 1.

⁴⁶ E.g. Trullanum, *Canon* 11; Macon, *Canon* 15.

CHAPTER IV
ISLAM
BY
E. ROSENTHAL

CHAPTER IV

ISLAM

The anachronism which seems to be implied in the correlation of Pharisaism and Islam disappears as soon as we substitute the word Judaism for Pharisaism. Anyone who knows anything about the historic growth of Judaism will readily admit that this change in terms is justified, for the Pharisees were the torchbearers of Judaism as distinct from Christianity and Islam. As the heirs of Ezra and the *Soferim*, they laid the foundations of Judaism as represented in Mishnah, Talmud and Midrash, in their *Halakhic* as well as in their *Aggadic* parts. Pharisaism is, therefore, not taken here as a politico-religious movement confined to a particular epoch of Jewish history, though it is well to bear in mind that the Pharisees played their part, both actively and passively, in the political life of Judaea under the Hasmonaean and Herodian dynasties and under Roman rule.

By Islam we understand here not the political movement of the Arabs and the building up of the Islamic empire, but the specific attitude towards God and the world which united divergent racial and national elements. And here it is well to remember that Islam originally had a purely religious meaning for its founder Muhammad. We are concerned with Islam as another growth on the Semitic soil from which had sprung Judaism and Christianity. Nobody will doubt that most fruitful relations exist between the three religions. In fact, as stated in the Preface, we

are concerned partly with ideas common both to Judaism and Christianity, as, for example, Fatherhood of God, Universalism, Personal Responsibility, Retribution, Belief in Resurrection and a Hereafter. But agreement on this point does not carry us very far, for as soon as we turn to particular institutions, the scholars who have carried out research on them differ widely as to their Jewish or Christian source.

A few general observations may, therefore, not be out of place. In dealing with religious conceptions, allowance must be made for a psychological factor common to all mankind. Not only is belief in a divinity naturally innate in the human mind, but the human mind exhibits an almost uniform reaction to certain impressions, whether to natural phenomena, the fear of the unknown or of death, or to moral, ethical and religious concepts, under the influence of prayer and by the practice of ritual. If this be true for mankind in general, it must especially be taken into account with regard to the Semites, whose specific contribution to the spiritual growth of a large part of the civilized world has ever consisted, and still consists, in their religious genius.

An unbiased historical investigation cannot deny that the first momentous influence in this direction was exercised by the Jews and that Christianity originated from Judaism and developed in close contact with and, later, in conscious opposition to Judaism. When Islam, i.e. the absolute and unquestioned submission to the Supreme Will of Allah, was first preached and propagated by Muhammad, he was confronted by Judaism and Christianity, which were then fully developed. He naturally was attracted by them. It is

generally agreed that there is nothing original in Muhammad's teaching, at any rate nothing of substance which cannot be traced to one or other of the two religions or, perhaps, to Zoroastrianism. This is, to a large extent, true of the realms of doctrine, ritual and certain branches of Law. From a theological point of view it would, therefore, be extremely difficult to understand how this mixture, void, as it seems, of originality, could attract such a large following. The answer is that quite apart from the favourable opportunity brought about by the particular economic and social situation of Arabia at that time, Islam is *not* merely the sum total of all these foreign elements. Muhammad and his religion provide a classical example of the truism that it is not so much the *material* transferred as the *method* of transfer which is of importance. In the same way, what is here noteworthy is the manner in which Muhammad adapted his material to basic Arab conceptions and how he made it effective to achieve his purpose, viz. the system of Islam, which had its origin in Arabia. Another point must also be taken into account, namely, the simple fact that influence can be exercised effectively only where the ground is prepared and where there is a mental predisposition to welcome the influence. If it is, therefore, in general, always very difficult to isolate and identify a definite influence, the matter is even more complicated in our case, in which two religions of a common origin, closely resembling each other in many respects, can put forward legitimate claims to have served as a model for Muhammad and for subsequent Islam. A further difficulty arises from the fact that Aramaic was a language in which both Judaism and Christianity

expressed their thoughts and named their institutions. However, the attempt made in the following exposition to assign influence or to show contact is the result of a careful perusal of the relevant sources and the vast literature on the subject. Valuable research has been done on the problem under discussion, especially by Geiger, Goitein, Goldziher, Grünbaum, Heller, Horovitz, Hirschfeld, Mittwoch, Speyer and Becker, Bergsträsser, Juynboll, Sachau, Schacht, Wensinck: the present writer follows these scholars in the main, while maintaining his independence of them in certain parts.

We can speak of direct influence only where literary and archaeological records give proof of it, but it is certainly not always sufficient to consult the records alone, and the results of research are not always final. Caution is therefore imperative.

Political and social contact existed for centuries between Jews and Arabs,* and one of the most creative periods of Jewish history arose and passed with the Islamic civilization. All branches of Jewish life were affected, and the Muslims acted as the teachers of the Jews in the fields of philosophy, poetry, grammar, lexicography, medicine and science. Of these nothing need be said here because they did not affect Judaism in its fundamental concepts. It is true that new branches grew on the tree and results, remarkable within Judaism and without, were achieved, e.g. by Yehudah Hallevi and Moses Maimonides, to mention only two outstanding characters. But the stem of *Halakhah* was

* On this see Prof. Margoliouth's *Schweich Lectures* for 1921 (Oxford 1924). This valuable book deals with the relations of Arabs and Israelites prior to the rise of Islam and it does not, therefore, directly concern us now.

so deeply rooted and so predominant that the secular manifestations of the Jewish genius (if one can at all use the term "secular" here) actually bore fruit rather outside than inside Judaism. For the Jewish doctors and philosophers acted as intermediaries for Greek philosophy and science as taught by the Muslims. Although philosophy was seen from the outset in its relation to religion, it cannot enter our purview, which must be confined exclusively to purely religious ideas and forms.

Jewish influence on Islam is to be detected both positively and negatively, i.e. both in acceptance and in rejection of material. Muhammad took over biblical stories and legends, putting in an Islamic touch here and there. Some of them go back to a Christian source (e.g. to Ephraem Syrus), but Christian influences must remain outside our discussion. In ritual and prayer a considerable influence can be traced, but, at the same time, Muhammad and Muhammadan tradition often draw a clear distinction between a particular practice in Islam and in Judaism. Many an Islamic saying and custom is dictated by strong opposition to its Jewish antecedents, as we shall see later.

I propose to consider briefly such borrowings and rejections, first, as regards the biblical element in the *Kur'an*; here the object is—with the important exception of passages referring to Abraham—chiefly illustration and edification. Secondly, in prayer there is undoubtedly and unmistakably considerable borrowing from Judaism. Thirdly and lastly, in the conception of an all-embracing religious Law, we find not only striking parallelism with Judaism but also actual Jewish in-

fluence, both in general principles and in concrete examples.

Let us, first, consider briefly what Muhammad and his commentators borrowed from the *Aggadah*. Though Muhammad had, in all probability, no direct knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, he knew, by conversations with Jews and Christians, that *Taurat* (Torah) was revealed to Moses, *Zabur** (the Psalter) to David and *Injil* (the Gospel) to Jesus. He, therefore, acknowledged both communities as '*ahl al-kitab*',† those who possess a "Book", i.e. a Divine revelation sent down from Heaven out of the original Book of God. At first, Muhammad taught that he had received the same revelation, only in Arabic. He may have been convinced that his *Kur'an* did not differ from revealed Scriptures, since of these Scriptures he had no direct knowledge. At the same time, we may assume that political considerations also played their part. For he hoped to attract many Jews to his teaching. He, as the "Seal of the Prophets", naturally stood on the shoulders of the earlier prophets. A decisive change appears to have taken place in Medina, where Muhammad encountered considerable opposition on the part of the Jews, who not only refused to accept the new faith, but, by their questions, caused Muhammad much dismay and great difficulties, pointing out many contradictions between their tradition, as it in fact was, and what Muhammad alleged it to be. They could not easily be silenced by his statement that Gabriel brought this *Kur'an* from Heaven. Undoubtedly, he also met with opposition on the part

* Or, *Zubūr*: for the vocalization, see Lane's *Lexicon*, s.v.

† It is unfortunately necessary to point out that this oft-misused term is not limited to Jews, who are sometimes wrongly called "*The people of the Book*".

of his own Arabs, who did not pay heed to Muhammad's version of biblical stories, which they had already heard from the Jews. The Arabs also disagreed with other, more vital, parts of his teaching. The Prophet's friendly attitude towards the Jews changed into hostility, as soon as he discovered their determination to hold their own, and the only way open to him to explain the discrepancy which existed between the Jewish and his own version, was to charge the Jews with the falsification of their Scriptures.* His successors, who, for polemic or apologetic reasons, were more familiar than he was with the actual Old Testament, as the result of careful study, repeated his denunciations, because it had become apparent that the differences could not be explained away by any other means. They repeated this argument again and again in their polemics against the Jews, and among those who collected and interpreted Muslim tradition we find a growing tendency against the *Israiliyāt*, i.e. stories about the *Banu Israil*. That these stories found their way into Islam is due, first to Muhammad himself, and secondly to his commentators, who naturally

* The same charge was brought by the Christians, see above, p. 123.

[In later times, the tables were turned. It was alleged that so far from the Prophet having been perplexed by awkward biblical questions from Jews and Christians, he answered them, confuted and converted his questioners. For the Rabbi of Khaibar, Abdallah ibn Salam, see G. F. Pijper, *Het Boek der Duizend Vragen*, Leiden, 1924. Pijper identifies Abdallah with Nicodemus (John III, 2, 10; VII, 50-2). The popularity of these stories about Jews and Christians, converted as a result of their *questionnaires* being answered, was very great. Thus, Ph. S. van Ronkel gives an account of such tales preserved in West-Sumatran Malay manuscripts; the literature in Malay is extensive. (*Acta Orientalia*, X, 1, pp. 56 sqq. (Leiden, 1931).)]

looked to Jewish sources for an explanation of what was obscure and abrupt in the *Kur'anic* version of biblical stories. Jewish converts undoubtedly supplied the material to some extent.*

Before we discuss briefly Muhammad's dependence on the Old Testament in his *Kur'an*, we must touch upon some of the leading religious ideas which he accepted from Judaism and Christianity. Allah is Creator of Heaven and Earth, All-powerful, Omniscient and Merciful; these are familiar words to every Jew and Christian. The idea with which the Prophet stirred Arabia, however, was that of the Imminent Judgement followed by the reward of the pious in Paradise and the punishment of the wicked in Hell. Whether this idea came to him direct from Judaism or Christianity cannot be ascertained. Terror and trembling seize upon mankind when the Day of Judgement is believed to be drawing near, all are awaiting "the hour", "the day of decision", "the resurrection". As can be seen by these few examples, Muslim eschatology owes indeed very much to Judaism and Christianity: in the latter faith, the idea was more stressed than in the former (see

* On this point S. D. Goitein adduces new material of considerable importance, in his contributions to *Tarbiṣ* (see bibliography at the end of this chapter). Goitein's source is mainly information current in the circles of Málík ibn Dínár, as contained in the third part of the *Hilyat al-'awliyā* of Abu Nu'aim. Since, in the *Kur'an* and earlier Muslim writers, the later prophets, with the exception of Jonah, are not mentioned by name, it is noteworthy that Goitein has found passages taken from Isaiah 1, Jeremiah and Psalms. The Muslims were acquainted with the Decalogue also. Goitein cites a saying of Muhammad: "God, the Exalted, made the Sabbath for them [sc. the Jews] as a holiday, but He chose for us the sixth [day: *loc. cit.* p. 518]." I regret that I have been unable to utilize his first article, on the '*Israiliyyāt*', in an earlier issue of *Tarbiṣ*.

above, p. 31). There are striking parallels with apocryphal and especially apocalyptic literature. Thus verse 17 in *Sura LXXIII*, "How, therefore, will ye escape, if ye believe not, the day which shall make children grey-headed," reminds us of verse 25 of chapter xxiii in the Book of Jubilees, "And the heads of the children will be white with grey hair." The idea that there is no human intercession, expressed in *Sura LXXIV*, 48: "So the intercession of intercessors shall not avail them" (cp. Ps. XLIX, 8), and the description in *Sura LXXX*, 33 sqq., "On that day shall a man fly from his brother, and his mother and his father and his wife and his children,"¹ are both to be found in the Ezra Apocalypse, vii, 102–15. The corresponding verses may be quoted here:

And I answered and said: If I have found favour in thy sight, shew further unto me, thy servant, this also: whether in the Day of Judgment the just will be able to intercede for the ungodly or to intreat the Most High for them, whether fathers for children, or children for parents, or brethren for brethren, kinsfolk for their next of kin or friends for them that are most dear. And he answered me and said: Since thou hast found favour in my sight, I will shew thee this also. The Day of Judgment is a day of decision and displayeth unto all the seal of truth. Even as now a father sendeth not his son or a son his father, or a master his slave or a friend him that is most dear, that in his stead he may be sick, or sleep or eat, or be healed; so never shall any one then pray for another in that Day, neither shall one lay a burden on another; for then shall all bear every one his own righteousness or unrighteousness....²

The knowledge of such passages is due rather to Christian than to Jewish transmission. But Rabbinic parallels are also to be found, so e.g. *T.B. Hag.* 16a

(Germ. trs. G. III, 841) that man's own limbs testify against him. A clear Jewish element is the familiar idea that man's deeds are entered in a book which will be read to him when he is tried by the Heavenly Court. Only a wall separates Paradise from Hell (*Sura* vii, 44). Paradise is called Garden of Eden.³ The pleasures of Paradise are depicted as a banquet, as in Judaism and Christianity. Examples could be multiplied.⁴ "There is no God but God"; this has been identified as coinciding with the Targum to II Sam. xxii, 32. "Sovereign of the Worlds",⁵ as an appellation of God, probably goes back to Jewish influence. Muslim tradition quotes *Kur'anic* passages with the introductory formula, "The Exalted One speaks", exactly as we have in the Talmud the formula "The Merciful (*Rahmana*) speaks", meaning "the Scripture says". Not only the idea of the great Day of Reckoning but also the prophetic task of warning the people lest they might not stand the dreaded test, weighed, both of them, so heavily on Muhammad that he characteristically turned to those

* [It is suggested by L. Goldschmidt, in his German trs. of the *Kur'an*, that this phrase originally meant "Sovereign of the inhabitants of the World". The plural of the Hebrew '*Olam*' is '*Olamoth*', therefore, he holds, '*Olamim*' must be a plural of the gentilic adjective '*Olami*', contracted for '*Olamiyim*', cf. *Misrim*, for *Misriyyim*. Against Goldschmidt it may be argued, (1) that there are certain passages in the Bible where "inhabitants" would make no sense, e.g. Ps. LXXVII, 6; Isa. XXVI, 4; LI, 9, etc. In fact in no biblical passage would such a meaning be suitable; (2) the biblical plural is always masculine: the feminine does not occur.

On the other hand, it may well be held that the Arabic phrase, being theological, would be taken not from biblical Hebrew but either from Aramaic or from Rabbinic Hebrew. In Rabbinic Hebrew '*Olamoth*' is more common than '*Olamim*.]

biblical personalities whom he could treat as fore-runners. Thus, we meet Noah, Moses, Aaron and Jonah.* Other characters, like David and Solomon, serve as models of piety and wisdom. The story of Cain and Abel is told to teach a lesson. In fact, all these stories are recounted to support Muhammad's appeal to his hearers to embrace the true religion, to follow him, the last in this long line of prophets, along the path to Allah, whose will must be obeyed. They serve as illustrations, but they are very often more than a merely edifying element and their purpose is not only to satisfy the Oriental's eagerness for beautiful tales and legends. This can be seen in the case of Solomon, who is given more prominence than David, because of his relations with the Arabian Queen of Sheba, whom the Muslim Solomon converted to Islam, after having addressed to her a letter to this end, exactly modelled

* [It is noteworthy that while Muhammad frequently claims to be a "plain warner" (*Nadīrun mubīnun* or *Bashīrun*), he does not take Ezekiel as his prototype and yet this prophet, one would have imagined, would be the obvious example, since he was divinely appointed to be a "Watchman" (*Sofeh*, see Ezek. III, 17; XXXIII, 2, 6, 7). Muhammad, however, does not seem to have known of Ezekiel, unless the reference in *Surah* II, 244 is to the vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezek. XXXVII, 1-10). Muhammad would have had deliberately to borrow the term *Sofeh* from the Hebrew Bible. Or else he would have had to use a synonym, since the Arabic *Safā* does not have the sense of "watching", as in Hebrew *Safāh*, and where it does occur, it signifies the idea of *purity* or of *selection*.]

Possibly Ezekiel was omitted because he does not furnish an example of a signal retributive action on the part of Providence, e.g. the flood, Red Sea, etc., that could catch the imagination. As an ethical teacher, he might not be so well-known. Even to-day, the Noah's Ark is to be found in the nursery, but the child has to pass many years before hearing the name of Ezekiel.]

upon Muhammad's letters to the princes.* Of still greater significance is Abraham. Here we can clearly trace the change which has taken place in Muhammad's attitude towards Judaism. At first, Abraham was, as Isaiah styles him, the "Friend of God"; but later he is called a *hanif*, i.e. neither Jew nor Christian.† The Jews, moreover, are stated to have falsified the pure Abrahamic religion. It was therefore Muhammad's task to restore the pure faith of Abraham, the first Muslim. Abraham, as the father of Ishmael, and the founder of the *Ka'bah* was also the father of Islam.‡ It is only natural that, for Islam, Ishmael should be of greater importance than Isaac. Some commentators go even so far as to substitute the sacrifice of Ishmael

* The easiest Jewish source for those who desire to compare the Jewish and Muslim accounts of the Queen of Sheba will be found in the *Targum Sheni* to Esther in Appendix to Cassel's *Commentary on Esther*, trs. Bernstein, vol. xxxiv, N.S. of T. and T. Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 1888.

† This Arabic term means one who has the real and true, original, innate religion. See further, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, II, s.v. "Hanif". [The Hebrew *Hanef* means *profane* or *godless*, the opposite of the Arabic. The root in both languages came from an original *vox media* and possessed a neutral conception, *to incline*, either *to* or *from* the right direction.]

‡ James Montgomery in a very stimulating and original study entitled "Arabia and the Bible", lays stress on the influence of Arabia and Arab customs, etc., on the Bible, thus crossing swords with the Pan-Babylonians and Pan-Egyptians. But he certainly goes too far when he states: "The picture of Abraham's manners and dignity is exemplary for the courtesy and self-possession of the Arab sheikh" (p. 24). The striking resemblance seems to me hardly to justify Arab influence on the biblical story but rather to point to the common Nomadic origin and Nomadic standard of life which the early Hebrew nomads share with the Arab *Badawin*. That David should be a poet according to an Arab model, the poet-king Imrulqais, is difficult to accept. Otherwise, this interesting study is full of fine observations.

for that of Isaac, especially since no name is given in the *Kur'anic* passage on which they comment. It would lead too far to give examples of the way in which Muhammad and especially his commentators, Zamahshari, Baidawi, Tabari and Ibn al-Athir, have told the tale of Adam, Cain and Abel, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, Joseph, David, Solomon, Jonah, etc. Suffice it to say that there is hardly any exact correspondence with the biblical narrative in the *Kur'an*.^{*} But apart from distortions and mistakes, most of the elements can be traced to Midrashic sources. The route taken by these stories is: *Aggadah*, *Kur'an*, *Hadith* (Muslim legend after Muhammad) and later (Jewish) *Aggadah*. It is, however, not relevant to our purpose to follow out this course in detail, as these tales never exercised a strong influence—if any at all—on the real structure of Islam or Judaism, eagerly as they may have been read and heard by the people. Among those writings which have adopted Islamic versions are the *Midrash hag-gadol*, *Šefer hay-yashar*, *Pirke d'R. Eliezer*, *Shebhet Musar*, etc. These later *Aggadic* writings aim at clearing out Islamic tendencies, e.g. the third visit of Abraham to Ishmael with the founding of the *Ka'bah* is not mentioned, whereas many miraculous manifestations of Solomon's wisdom found their way from Islamic into these later Jewish legends.⁶ Such an influence of a purely formal literary character is actually very insignificant compared with the mass of *Aggadic* material, both of Talmud and Midrashic collections, which formed and embellished the legends told in the *Kur'an* and subsequent Muslim tradition. Many a feature was

* See Goitein's *'Israiliyyat* (loc. cit. p. 518), also p. 178 below. The whole article merits careful study.

taken over not directly from Jewish sources but from the legends of the Syrian Christians, who, in their turn, borrowed them from the Jewish *Aggadah*.

Much more significant is the fact that Islam took over religious *institutions* from Judaism and to these we shall turn now. Though it is impossible to include in our survey Islamic and Jewish heterodoxies, there can be no doubt that many institutions and customs on either side can be traced to those movements, e.g. the Islamic prohibition of marriage between uncle and niece, which was a point of dispute between Rabbinic and Sectarian Judaism; the same may be said of theological speculation. Especially, the Karaites influenced Islamic heterodox theologians and were in turn influenced by Muslim criticism of the *Kur'an* which the Karaites applied to the Bible.*

Muhammad himself had adopted the Fast of 'Ashura,⁷ but there is a tradition that, when it was pointed out to him that the Jews fasted on the tenth, he intended to antedate it to the ninth day. Others wanted to fast on the eleventh as well, and the final decision was that a whole month, the *Ramadhan*, should be instituted for fasting. Already at this early stage, then, we observe how an institution, which was originally Jewish, was altered in order to draw a line of unmistakable distinction between Muslims and Jews. It is often expressly

* The Karaites are a Jewish sect which originated in the eighth century, flourished in the ninth and subsequent centuries, surviving to the present day. They opposed Rabbinic-Talmudic Judaism and acknowledged only the Scripture, *Mikra*, as final authority (see *Enc. Jud.* ix, s.v. "Karaeer"). [As to the opinion of Islam about Karaites and their differences from Rabbanites, see the *Fatwas* of the representatives of the four schools, in *A Karaite Conversion Story*, published by Hirschfeld in *Jews' Coll. Jub.* Vol. London, 1906, pp. 81 sqq.]

stated that such a rite is meant to be in contrast and opposition to the Jewish rite. We need think only of the changing of the *Kiblah* (the direction in prayer), from Jerusalem to Mecca. Minor details like the limitation of the original 'Ashura fast to the time between sunrise and sunset (the rule in Islam for fasting) as opposed to the Jewish practice of fasting from sunset until sunset on the following day, illustrate clearly this tendency. There is, however, another striking parallel between the Islamic 'Ashura fast and the Jewish Day of Atonement, for Muslim tradition connects the fast with the "sending-down" of the *Kur'an*, whereas Judaism connects it with the second giving of the Ten Commandments by God to Moses on Sinai.⁸ The Day of Atonement is the only fast day which can fall on a Sabbath, therefore it is clearly in opposition to this custom not to permit any fast in connexion with 'Ashura on Friday. Muhammad is credited with a tradition that Friday should be observed as a day of Public Worship and Prayer, for on this day the Jews prepared for their Sabbath, and it is further stated that, apart from the service, Friday was to be an ordinary working day, as opposed to Sabbath and Sunday.⁹ Another minor detail is the Islamic imitation of the Jewish custom of the slaughter of animals as a ritual which had to be accompanied by benedictions. Here, however, another tendency of Islam can be observed, namely, to lighten "the burden of the Law", a tendency already expressed in the *Kur'an*. Thus a gradual lightening can be seen, until, finally, it was stated that a Muslim need not even mention the name of Allah, as he was always conscious of the presence of Allah in whose name everything was

* See p. 154*.

done.⁹ (That Judaism also knows of this lightening of the "burden" can be seen from *Pes.K.*, f. 158a (Germ. trs. W. p. 226) with regard to prayer, quoted in S. Schechter's article on the Law in *J.Q.R.* viii, 375: "God says to Israel, I bade thee read the prayers unto me in the Synagogues; but if thou canst not, pray in thy house; and if thou art unable to do this, pray when thou art in thy field; and if this be inconvenient to thee, pray on thy bed; and if thou canst not even do this, think of me in thy heart.") Such and similar cases would be negligible if they did not form part of a whole chain of accepted or changed Jewish customs and institutions. But here there is still a wide field of research.

One particular sphere, however, has been investigated, and Professor Mittwoch has published the important results of his searching comparative study in his well-documented monograph, *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des islamischen Gebets und Kultus*, Berlin, 1913. This study is the answer to H. Becker's attempt to prove Christian influence on the Islamic cult throughout.¹⁰ Although Mittwoch's arguments are very sound and convincing, not every detail can be established with absolute certainty. Some of the striking similarities to the Jewish prayer may be mentioned here. I cannot share the view advanced by L. Friedländer, in his review of Mittwoch's monograph,¹¹ that it would seem unlikely that Islam should have deliberately modelled its order of service on the Jewish rival. Why should it not have done so? Why should it have modelled itself rather on Christianity, as Becker wishes to prove? Such an imitation surely is not surprising, since we know how, in the political sphere, Byzantine and

Persian methods of political and financial administration were adopted and how Jews and Christians, though not without protest, had to be employed in the public service. In view of what has been said above about the tendency to alter Jewish practices after they had been taken over, and, further, taking literary evidence into account, there can be no doubt of a most active Jewish influence on Islam. But, however many Jewish elements we find, the Islamic service, as such, fine though it be in many respects, is anything but Jewish!

To begin with a disputed detail, the frequency of kneeling and prostration during the *Salat al-Jumu'a*, the Friday public prayer. Is this a Christian or a Jewish inheritance? So long as we do not know more about the religious practice of the Jews of Medina and of Arabia generally, we cannot give a definite answer, but Mittwoch has put forward some passages—though not many—and has pointed to corresponding expressions which make the assumption of Jewish influence not impossible.¹² Whether the *minbar* is to be traced to the Jewish *bema* or the Christian pulpit cannot be easily decided. To answer this question would involve a thorough knowledge of the architecture of synagogues and Oriental churches.* But it is certainly not impossible that, just as the Jewish liturgy influenced the Christian, so may the architectural design of synagogues have influenced that of churches to some extent. But the decision must be left to the expert. However, the parallel cannot be overlooked that the *minbar* is used

* [It is interesting to recall that Ashkenazic—but not Sefardic or Oriental Judaism—has preserved the word in the term *Almemar*, reading-desk.]

for the *hutbah* (sermon), just as is the *bema* for the reading of Torah and *Haftarah*. The *hutbah* is divided into two parts and is delivered by the *'imam*, who is identified by Mittwoch with the *sh'liah sibbur*, the leader of the congregation in prayer. Whether the *hutbah* corresponds to the reading of Torah and *Haftarah*, as Mittwoch points out, or to the Christian reading of Scripture and sermon, cannot easily be decided; both interpretations are possible, especially as it is uncertain whether Christian usage itself goes back to the Jewish custom referred to.

There are, however, other more important correspondences where a Jewish model is evident. There are five daily prayers in Islam, two of which certainly were instituted very early by Muhammad himself. A tradition, invented to support the institution of the five, tells us that Muhammad received, during his ascension to Heaven, the command to institute fifty prayers a day, and because of the repeated intervention of Moses, God finally agreed to five.¹³ We note the connexion with Moses, which, however, would not suffice alone to assume a Jewish model for the number of prayers. I would suggest also that the story how Muhammad conversed with Moses and ascended again and again to God, may, in its literary form, have some connexion with Abraham's pleading for Sodom and Gomorrah as related in the Bible. The explanation, given by Mittwoch, how five prayers originated out of the Jewish three daily prayers, cannot be repeated here; however, his suggestion, later in his monograph, that the choice of five may have to do with the five prayers of the Day of Atonement seems to me more plausible.¹⁴ Another suggestion is that five have been

chosen as a contrast with three Jewish and seven Christian daily prayers, but it is of greater significance, at any rate, that *Salat* (from Syriac *Selotha*—also used in the Talmud) corresponds exactly to *Tefillah*, as distinct from the Islamic *Du'a*, the individual prayer, which corresponds to *Tahanunim*.¹⁵ *Tefillah* means prayer, generally, and the Eighteen Benedictions, in particular, according to the Talmud. *Selotha* was used by the Jews of Arabia, as they used 'Ashura for *Yom Kippur*. The term *al-Rahman* for God is identical with the Aramaic *Rahmana* of the Talmud. Ritual purity is obligatory before participation in the *Salat*, as originally it was in Judaism also; it seems that the Jews, in the time of Muhammad, still strictly adhered to it. In general, it may be noted that the laws governing ritual purity and ablutions, etc., were accepted by Islam in the form in which they were practised by the Jews, whereas Muhammad rejected most of the dietary laws, which he considered as a punishment for the Jews. Here, again, a lightening of the "burden" is to be noted. Now, the integral parts of the *Tefillah* are the reading of the *Shema'* and the *Tefillah* in the narrower sense, the '*Amidah* or Eighteen Benedictions. Indeed, we find the same in the Islamic service. '*Amidah** has its equivalent in the Arabic *Kiyām* (*ikam-as-salat*) which is the more striking as *ruku'* and *sujud*, kneeling and prostration, play such a prominent part.¹⁶ As it seems that these are as old as *Kiyām*, we must assume that *Keri'oth* and *Hishtahawayoth*† were still practised by the

* Ultimately, the Hebrew root 'amadh (whence '*amidah* is derived) and the Arabic *kāma* (whence *kiyām*) mean "to stand", though *kiyām* here is used in a derived sense.

† Kneelings and prostrations.

Jews of Arabia, as was the case in earlier times in Judaism. The Islamic *Kira'a** was identified by Mittwoch with the *Keri'ath Shema'* and he finds traces of the Eighteen Benedictions in the *takbir*, the pronouncing of the formula *Allahu akbar* (Allah is great), and he draws a parallel between the *takbir* and the *ha'el hagadol* of the first of these Eighteen Benedictions. The pronouncing of *salam* corresponds to the *birkath hash-shalom*.¹⁷ Mittwoch sees another corresponding element in the '*adan*'—the call to prayer—performed by the *mu'addin*.¹⁸ Now, it is obvious that the first '*adân*', pronounced by the *mu'addin* from the Minaret, which is an imitation of the spire of the church, has no Jewish equivalent. But the second '*adân*', spoken in the Mosque, is reminiscent of the invitation to prayer with the following recital of the *Shema'* by the *Hazzan* (in later times *Shammash*).¹⁹ Apart from these elements in the service, the same classes of people have to attend it, both in Judaism and in Islam. Communal prayer is meritorious in both. But Islam does not, with the exception of the *Salat al-Jumu'a* on Friday, prescribe a quorum of worshippers. Many more instances could be quoted, such as prayers on special occasions (for rain, in illness, on a voyage, etc.). Only one point may be cited in addition, namely, the *niyya*, *intentio*, required in prayer, which corresponds in meaning exactly to the Jewish *kawwanah*, which is necessary for every religious act and which comprises concentration on the Deity, as well as an inner willingness and humble devotion.

No further proof is needed to admit direct and decisive Jewish influence on Islamic cult and worship.

* Recital of the opening *Sura* of the *Kur'an*.

Here we can even speak of Pharisaic influence, because the Jewish liturgy was moulded by them to a considerable extent.

So far we are treading upon safe ground. Research into the all-important problem of the relation between Islamic and Jewish Law has not yet been undertaken systematically, although Professor Mittwoch announced in his study, referred to above, the preparation of such a comprehensive work. He states on pp. 3-4:

The influence of the Jewish religious law extends to the fundamental principles and methods on which the Islamic law rests and according to which it develops, as well as to almost all of its parts. Precepts relating to prayer and cult, to the poor-tax, fast, ritual cleanliness and the purification of the body from uncleanness, testify to the influence of Judaism, as much as do the religious customs of everyday life or of special occasions—birth, circumcision, marriage, death—and the properly legal parts of the religious law.

This statement will be found correct even by those who have only a limited knowledge both of Jewish and of Islamic Law, but it must necessarily be substantiated by a detailed investigation. So far, only a promising beginning has been made, and a few examples will illustrate this. First, however, the question may be asked, how can this be the case and who were those who exercised such an influence on the growth and development of Muslim Law? The last question can be answered briefly. In the year 637, Babylonia came under Arab rule, and here well-organized Jewish communities with academies of Jewish learning flourished.

We know that some, indeed many, Jews and Christians embraced Islam, partly for ideal reasons—they may have hoped that Muhammad would lead

them to the promised land, stirred by his simple yet effective eschatology—partly prompted by material advantages (freedom from the poll-tax). If Muhammad did not wish to make Islam a burden for his Arabs, he made it even easier still for converts who came from the *'ahl al-kitab*, who could become Muslims by formal acceptance of the Muslim creed. But it may certainly be questioned whether those Jews who were well versed in the Law and customs of their own religion—not to speak of its lofty ideals—would see a valid reason for following the religion of the conqueror, especially as they had long ceased to enjoy political independence. But we must be careful not to project our modern ideas and reasoning back into those days. And it must further be remembered that the religious all-embracing Law of Islam took shape only gradually in the course of centuries. Must it, therefore, be assumed that the Jews influenced the Muslim theologians and jurists in frequent polemic discussions? And if Jewish *Aggadah* played such a prominent part in the narrative of the *Kur'an*, why should Jewish *Halakhah* not have its share in the formation of Muslim Law? Social relations certainly played their part as well. And yet it must be taken into account that, in principle, Islam may have arrived at its conception of the perfect unalterable catholic law at least in part independently of Judaism, if we assume a common Semitic attitude to religion. Every religion based on a revelation which claims to be a guide through life, in the form of teaching and law, must constantly strive to develop this law, thereby safeguarding its sole authority in a continually changing world. Such a religion dare not weaken its unique basis of revelation. In each case it is claimed

that the Divine Law was revealed at a certain juncture in the life of the particular people which accepted it and to the needs of which it was suited. Political expansion, contact with other forms of culture and civilization, made it imperative to adapt the Law to such changed conditions, to make it flexible, so that it did not lose anything of its normative character, but, while moving with the times, it remained all-comprehensive; it thus secured the relation of every minute detail of everyday life to the plan delineated by the Divine Law-giver. The successors of Moses were faced with this problem, as were the successors of Muhammad. The letter of the Law had to stand; the only means of making it cover man's life, his relation to God and to his fellow-men, was to interpret this Law.* Judaism solved this difficulty by attaching to oral tradition binding legal character and authority equal to the written Law and by embodying in the *Halakhah* both Written and Oral Torah, which, according to tradition, had both been revealed to Moses on Sinai. The starting-point and, at the same time, the conclusion was Moses, as can be seen from the statement: *Halakhah le-Mosheh miš-Sinai.*† This legal principle has a double significance which has its exact counterpart in Islam. It means that the case

* On this see p. 211.

† [This difficult phrase probably is to be interpreted of primeval laws and customs, some generally accepted and some the subject of controversy, of which the origin was not established. See J. H. Weiss, *Dor.* I, ch. ix, pp. 67 foot sqq. As W. Bacher says, "...diese Formel hatte die Bestimmung Halachasätzen die nicht biblisch begründet werden konnten, den Überlieferungscharakter zuzuerkennen". It can be used of traditions, "deren Inhalt einen mosaischen Ursprung im strikten Sinne von vornherein ausschließt" (*K. Satzung vom Sinai*, pp. 58 and also 57).]

in point was *assumed* to have originated with Moses, the giver of the entire Law, the source of which is God. But it takes on not only authority but also antiquity which is also very essential. (With reference to Muslim tradition, compare the beginning of *Pirke Aboth* and its complete chain of tradition from Moses to the Men of the Great Synagogue as the precursors of the Pharisees, the teachers and interpreters of the Law.) It also means, therefore, that a custom is very old, although its origin is not known; but it is valid and part of the Oral Law, by being granted Mosaic-Sinaitic origin. This applies generally to deeply rooted popular customs which had to be accepted. A *halakhah* was valid as soon as a decision had been declared either by a majority or by any recognized teacher.

Another point to be considered is the method by which a new legal enactment was arrived at. In other words, how came Oral Torah into being? The answer is: by a number of hermeneutic rules, which made possible the decision needed in a particular case by deduction from the Written Torah. These rules were binding.

In turning to Islam, we recognize a similar development, though with some characteristic differences. The Divine Law, *Shar'* or *Shari'a*, is the sole true guide for the faithful Muslim, it is perfect, unalterable and it regulates his entire life. *Shari'a* means in Arabic exactly what *Halakhah* means in Hebrew. He who follows it takes the *straight, right route* leading to God, Whose will it teaches. The aim of man is to do the will of God, both in Judaism and in Islam, and in both the only way is to be found in the religious all-embracing Law. The science of Law is called *Fikh* in Arabic, those who practise it are called *Fukahā* or '*Ulamā*', which latter

term corresponds to the Hebrew *Hakhamim* or Rabbis.* Sometimes *Fikh* is used as synonym of *Shar‘*. This use is very interesting, as, if one may have recourse to algebraic equations:

Written + Oral Law = *Shar‘* or *Shari‘a*

and *Halakhah* = *Fikh*.

The methods by which Laws are deduced are styled '*uṣūl al-fīkh*', literally the *roots of fīkh*; they correspond in principle to the *middoth* of the Jewish hermeneutics, and some actually occur in both systems. The first and foremost source of *Fikh* is naturally the *Kur‘an*, as, in Judaism, the Torah. But as the *Kur‘an* is not sufficient to answer all possible questions which may arise in life, the Muslim commonwealth had to look for a safe guide, which the ‘*Ulama* found in the *Sunna* of the prophet Muhammad, i.e. in what he did and said. The *Sunna* was transmitted to posterity through traditions, *ahādīth*. *Hadīth* is a most powerful factor in the formation of Muslim Law. (It soon became a very remunerative profession to collect “prophetic traditions”.) Many traditions had to be invented to serve as justification for institutions and customs which had arisen without justification in the *Kur‘an*. Exactly so in Judaism many deeply rooted popular customs had to be legalized. The authenticity of a tradition could be tested in two ways. Formally or externally, its validity was established by an uninterrupted chain of

* Goldziher (in *Enc. Isl.* s.v. “*Shari‘a*”) would derive both terms from the Roman Law and its *prudentes*. But the Hebrew *hakhamim* is clearly older and genuine and it is more likely that at least the Arabic ‘*Ulama* is based on *Hakhamim*, especially since *Hokhma* in this connexion always means the wisdom of Torah.

transmitters. Internally or from the point of view of contents, the criterion for the acceptance of a *hadith* as a legal rule, was the '*ijma'* or *consensus* of opinion. This consensus, ideally that of the whole people, was soon restricted to the agreement of the *fukahā* of each generation. The '*ijma'* was infallible and irrevocable. If something was decided by '*ijma'*, it could not be reconsidered or even discussed. The chain of transmitting authorities had preferably to end with the Prophet Muhammad himself or, at any rate, with one of his '*ashab*', earliest associates and followers. This chain was called '*isnād*' and corresponds roughly to *halakhah le-Mosheh miš-Sinai*, or to a tradition related by some Rabbi in the name of another or a group of teachers or to the chain of tradition referred to above in *Pirke Abot*. '*Ijma*' has its roots also in Jewish practice, in that the respective schools accepted and laid down a certain rule or law. But there was no limited discussion and there was no finality as in Islam, where we find six universally acknowledged collections of *Hadith*, two of which were styled *sahīh*, sound. To these nothing could be added and they served as material for the four *madāhib* or schools, which were likewise orthodox and acknowledged each other. Though the differences are mainly confined to constitutional law and there are only minor differences in civil law, etc., there is not a universally accepted code, as we have it in the material embodied in the Talmud. It is significant, however, that the Talmud states the agreed decision as *halakhah*, but it also states the dissenting views of individual authorities, thus giving expression to freedom of teaching. A formal parallel can be drawn between these four schools or rites and the two famous schools of

Hillel and Shammai, which, however, did not develop into two distinct codifications. (As a matter of fact, ultimately the *Halakhah*, with few exceptions, follows the school of Hillel. See *Addenda*, p. 185.) An interesting parallel is to be drawn between the *Tannāim* and 'Amorāim in Judaism and the *Mujtahids* and *Mukallids* in Islam. The *Tannāim*, who were both independent and original, created Oral Tradition, whereas the 'Amorāim confined themselves to interpreting the work of the *Tannāim*, claiming neither right nor authority to deviate from the decisions laid down in the Mishnah and the collections of *Baraitoth*, thus acknowledging the superiority of the *Tannāim*, their predecessors. The *Mujtahids* represent 'Ijtihād, i.e. independent derivation of *Fīkh*, whereas the *Mukallids*, from the third century A.H., exercised *taklid*, i.e. they had "to clothe" their interpretations "with the authority" of an earlier *Mujtahid*. This shows clearly the same attitude and tendency on both sides, not only in the conscience of the respective teachers but also of the people whose steps in the "Law" they guided.

Returning once more to the *Sunna*, as the second "root", this can be likened, to some extent, to what we call Oral Torah in Judaism, but in the rather limited sense of a source of law, next to the Written Law. We must note the decisive difference, in that *Sunna* is bound up with the life of Muhammad, his words and ways, whereas the life of Moses never attained this exemplary status. A third "root"—disputed in the early days of Islam—is represented by *Kiyas*, analogy, combined with *ray'*, opinion, i.e. laws could be deduced from *Kur'an* and *Sunna* by means of analogy and inference, assisted by the discerning faculty (*ray'*)

of the jurists, provided that '*ijma'*, which forms the fourth "root", could be ascertained. We meet exactly the same *middah* or rule in the institution called *Hekkesh* in Judaism. There may also be traces of the method of *kal wahomer* (*a minore ad majus*) in Islam, not to speak of those legal methods which have their counterpart in Roman Law where the actual source of transmission may be doubtful.

Time does not permit the extension of this comparison, which is in itself anything but final in the form just presented. Here lies indeed the most important problem which still awaits thorough investigation by a scholar, equally expert in *Halakhah* and *Fikh*. There can, however, be no doubt that a remarkable parallelism exists between the principle of the Divine Law and its application to all spheres of man's life in this world and in that to come, for it is given with the purpose of guiding man through this life on earth so that he may obtain a share in the world to come.* The belief in a Hereafter is common to Judaism, Christianity and Islam, but although Islam attaches less importance to *this* life than does Judaism, it nevertheless does not regard it as a merely transient stage, the end of which is the expectation of entering Paradise. That there is not only semblance in principles and methods, but actual agreement in points of detail, extending from the religious duties in the narrower sense over social relations, morals and ethics, to purely legal matter, will be shown presently by a few examples. To credit Christianity with the prototype of Islam in that the whole of life is perceived under a religious aspect as a

* How far this parallelism is based on actual Jewish influence cannot yet be decided with finality.

serving of God and to charge Judaism with the casuistry to be found in some *minutiae* in the application of this lofty principle to human life is, to say the least, biased. One of the reasons why Muslim Law succumbed to the danger of formalism more easily than Judaism is certainly that the *Shari'a*—caused by the political development of the Islamic state—soon became purely theoretical and ideal; another reason is that the study of Muslim Law was reserved for a class of experts, whereas Judaism makes it a duty for every Jew to engage in the study of the Law as the authoritative manifestation of the Divine Will. The authoritative interpretation is, no doubt, the concern of experts. Casuistry is a necessary though regrettable corollary, but the true Pharisaic outlook always considered the spirit of the Law as more important than the letter, as may be inferred from the saying in *Mekhilta* (109b (Eng. trs. L. III, 197)), “for the Sabbath is given unto you, but you are not given to the Sabbath”, which is almost verbatim repeated by Jesus in Mark II, 27. This is said in direct connexion with the thirty-nine prohibitions on Sabbath.²⁰ As far as I know Muslim Law does not state the principle *simhah shel miṣwah*, the joy of performing a Commandment,* which is considered in Judaism the highest possible joy. Therefore the *Halakhah* always found a responsive echo in the hearts of the masses and an effort was always made to comply with its enactments, although the loss of political autonomy led to the injunction *dina d'malkhutha dina*† which meant that the civil law of the government superseded the

* On this see vol. I, pp. 138–40 and above, p. 48.

† On this see Rabinowitz's remarks on the force of local custom, below, p. 211.

Jewish civil law. A similar development took place in Islam, with the decisive difference, however, that the political government was Islamic, not foreign. Theoretically, the constitutional regulations never ceased to be; practically, however, any political authority, though contrary to the requirements of the *Shari'a*, was acknowledged and had to be obeyed. (It is noteworthy to find in this connexion a *hadith* which permits any devout Muslim to pray even behind an "unlawful" 'Imām, the underlying idea being that the community should be preserved at all cost intact.²¹ The same principle of the unity of the congregation is expressed in the Jewish saying: "Do not separate thyself from the congregation."²²

The faithful hoped for the time when the *Mahdi* or *Messiah*, who was a descendant of Muhammad, would restore the rule of the four orthodox Caliphs in justice, righteousness and peace. Realising that they had no opportunity of resisting illegal rulers actively, they resigned and fled into the ideal future. It is chiefly on this point that orthodox Islam is at variance with the *Shi'ite* and other sectarian groups. This is for us irrelevant; it suffices, therefore, to state that in Islam, as well as in Judaism, Messianic movements were frequently active in troubled political times, and that in both religions the conception of the Messianic idea is to be conceived partly in political circumstances. Under the influence of the all-embracing religious law, no conscientious Jew or Muslim could overlook the actual political conditions; he was painfully aware of the discrepancy between the world of the Law and the world of reality in which he found himself. Two ways were open, revolution or resignation. It was the latter which gave

birth to the Messianic idea, in that man sublimated his discontent and disgust at the state of affairs which were contrary to the revealed Will of God, as laid down in the Divine Law, into the pious hope for the ideal future, either on this earth or in the world to come.*

It is very likely that the *Mahdi* idea originated in Islam independently of Judaism. Whether the growth of this idea be mere parallelism or due to literary influence, we can at any rate follow up the same development in Islam as in Judaism. The more political unrest, the greater was the longing for the immediate coming of the *Messiah* or *Mahdi*. In both religions, it was this ideal which enabled the faithful to endure any kind of political government. Common to both is also the strong indignant disapproval of calculating in advance the arrival of the *Messiah*, as we can see from Jewish and Muslim tradition.†

Let us, finally, consider briefly the contact between the two laws, by selecting a few examples taken from the religious, social and ethical sphere. We find five categories of actions in both laws, they are: necessary; desirable and meritorious; permitted or neutral; reprehensible and actually forbidden. Islam made more allowance for human weakness, as we have seen, for example, with regard to the slaughtering of animals. The same applies to the benediction before eating. This was taken over by Islam, but the Kur'anic command

* Needless to say that this is only one root of Messianism, though an important reason for its origin.

† Cp. Goldziher, *loc. cit.* where reference is made to *Sanh.* 97b (Germ. trs. G. VII, 424), see index s.v. "Mahdi", esp. notes 120 sqq. See also A. H. Silver's book, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel*, New York, 1927, pp. 40 sqq.

was later, on the basis of the verbal form used, interpreted as a wish; out of a necessary act, it became a meritorious one.* Islam adopted the prohibition of making images of living beings. Mention was made above of the laws prescribing ritual purity, ablutions, etc., to which may be added the prohibition of eating pork, blood and carcasses, the only dietary laws Muhammad had taken over from Judaism. From the laws regulating marriage and family life, Muhammad adopted the death penalty of stoning for adultery, which he, however, lightened and changed into stripes, on account of an allegation brought against his wife 'A'isha. Another mitigation of this law insists, according to the Shafi'itic rite, on the necessity of four witnesses, whereas Jewish law knows of two only. In enumerating details, Muslim tradition uses the very same expression as *T.B. Makkoth 7a* (Germ. trs. G. vii, 537).

An interesting example, showing how Halakhic details have penetrated into Muslim Law, is given by Goitein, in pp. 78–9 of his article '*Inyanim Yehudhiyyim*' (cited in bibliography, below, p. 183). The subject is witchcraft (*Kish-shūf*), which both Islam and Judaism prohibited. Beladuri even uses a term reminiscent of '*Ohez'eth ha-'eynayim*, One who deceives by optical delusion.'†

* Goldziher, *loc. cit.* p. 61. Consult for the whole paper especially the chapters on "Die Entwicklung des Gesetzes" and "Dogmatische Entwicklung". This study is still the best introduction to the essential elements of Islam and is full of references to the questions under discussion.

† *T.B. Sanh.* 65 b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 279); *T.J. Sanh.* vii, § 19, f. 25 d, line 63 (French trs. S. xi, 25). Here the abstract noun, '*ahizath 'eynayim*' occurs. [In the Jerusalem Targum to Lev. xix, 26, on *Lo' the onēnu*, the correct reading, as Levy points out, should be '*ahudhe*' and the mysterious *Sanhedrin* is a gloss, referring to *T.B. Sanh.* 65 b. According to a manuscript cited by M. Ginsburger

Beladuri states that the accused was acquitted and not stoned.* Goitein traces this subject through Islamic literature and quotes other examples of Jews practising *Kish-shif*, showing how the Halakhah found its way into Islam. In No. 8, p. 78 he cites *T.B. Sanh.* 67b, as evidence of counter-accusations by Jews of this practice among the Arabs. But in this passage of *Sanhedrin* there is no mention of Arabs. According to the Arabic story, a Jew was summoned to Walid ibn Uḳba, to perform 'ahizath 'eynayim: he was killed by one of the Emir's enemies. When the Emir would have had the murderer put to death, it was argued that witchcraft was forbidden in Islam.

With regard to the Penal Code, the *ius talionis* is known also in Islam. Like Judaism, it lightened the literal application (*mammash* in the Talmud) by substituting payment of money (*mamon*).

Turning to social obligations, we find that *Zakat* (poor tax) and support of the poor generally, is regarded as one of the five "pillars" of Islam, and that attention to widows and orphans is a religious duty, in the same way as visiting a sick Muslim is meritorious. The tradition in which it is recommended reads like a translation of the saying in *Peah* 1, 1 (Engl. trs. D. p. 10)†, only put into the imperative by Bukhari (*Marda* 4):²³ "Accompany the dead (in burial), visit the sick and

(*Das Fragmententhargum*, p. 87, Berlin, 1899), the Jerusalem Targum uses the same phrase for *me'onen*, in Deut. xviii, 10. The corresponding Syriac idiom is attested by Mrs Margoliouth (p. 11 of J. Payne Smith's *Compendious Syr. Dict.* Oxford, 1903, s.v.) and it occurs in the *Peshitta* for Deuteronomy, *loc. cit.*, but not in the Leviticus passage.]

* *T.B. Sanh.* 67b (Germ. trs. G. vii, 286).

† See *Addenda*, p. 185.

spread peace.” Many more parallels could be quoted including the famous saying of Hillel.* In the realm of Commercial Law we meet with the prohibition of interest and usury.† Whether this prohibition was transmitted by the Christians or the Jews does not make any difference, as it certainly originated in Judaism. However, there is no need to quote example after example, for there can be no doubt that the conception of Muslim religious law is essentially the same as that of Jewish Law. The *Hakhamim* were considered by the Jews (*T.B. Bab. Bath.* 12a; Germ. trs. G. vi, 967) as the successors of the prophets, as the ‘*Ulamā* were styled their heirs (*Bukhari*, ‘*Ilm*, 10) and in another tradition Muhammad is credited with the saying: “The wise (‘*Ulama*) of my community are like the prophets of the people of Israel.”²⁴

There were periods in Jewish history when the Pharisees as the teachers of the people and the guardians of tradition acquired great influence and possessed considerable control of the affairs of state, e.g. in the reign of Queen Alexandra Salome, as did the *Fukaha* under the early ‘Abbasid Caliphs. But whereas the Pharisees and

* The answer to the question what a man must do in order to enter Paradise is that he has to give others what he himself would like to receive and to spare them that which he does not desire for himself—in addition to the ordinary duties of a Muslim (see *Enc. Jud.* x, s.v. “Islam”).

[For Hillel’s saying, see *T.B. Sab.* 31a (Germ. trs. G. i, 388): also *A.R.N.* version II, ch. xxvi, f. 27a. There is an important article, “The Negative Golden Rule”, by G. Brockwell King, in the *Journal of Religion* (U.S.A.), vol. viii, No. 2, April 1928, pp. 268 sqq.]

† See also Goldziher in *R.E.J.* xliv, 4, “Controverse Halachique entre Mahométans et Juifs”, where the legend of the judge is also quoted, corresponding to *T.B. Sab.* 116b (Germ. trs. G. i, 599). For usury see below, pp. 321 sqq.

their successors gathered round them the people, the 'Ulama became professional jurists who guarded the *Shari'a* and handed down tradition to a selected body of learned men only. The study of the "Law" has always been considered in Judaism the highest duty of every Jew from generation to generation, and thus the written and the oral Torah have been kept alive as a creative and determining factor in the Jews' life.

Fikh has not been without influence on later Judaism, as can be seen in Saadya's and Maimonides' *halakhic* writings. Especially Maimonides shows, in his *Mishneh Torah*, familiarity with the classification of *Fikh* and the "roots", above all with the '*ijma'*, and with the '*isnād*'. But here, as was the case with Biblical legends, the "influence" was purely formal; an originally Jewish method is applied now in its fuller developed Islamic form. A stronger "Islamic" influence is to be traced in Jewish religious philosophy in problems, method and argument. This cannot be dealt with here. The same applies to a comparison between the Islamic and the Jewish ways of solving such theological problems as: *Is God the Creator of Evil as well as of Good?* or that of *Predestination and Free Will*, which is closely connected with the former problem. To settle the question of the participation of Judaism and Christianity in the formation of the Islamic attitude to life and the universe, a comprehensive investigation into the relationship between *Halakhah* and *Shari'a* would certainly be of considerable help.

If due allowance be made for a parallel development, in consequence of a common Semitic and, indeed, a common human outlook, there still remains, I believe, actual influence in some important districts. The em-

bodiment in the *Kur'an* and Muslim historiography of Biblical history as the scene of the relation between God and the people of Israel as an example for the faithful,²⁵ the undoubted influence of Jewish cult and ritual, either by adoption or rejection, and, finally, the striking semblance in the conception of the Divine Laws, in their basic principles, methods and individual legal enactments, speak clearly enough. Many points are still controversial, some scholars would claim Judaism,²⁶ some Christianity,²⁷ as the foundation of Islam.* Many questions still await research. Islam, like every historical phenomenon, is of composite structure, and to its upbuilding other than Jewish and Christian factors may also have contributed.

* While this essay was in the proof stage, a valuable contribution to the study of this question has appeared and I regret that I cannot take adequate account of it here: it is by Prof. Joh. Fück and is entitled *Die Originalität des Arabischen Propheten* (*Z.D.M.G.* Band 90, Hefte 3, 4, 1936). Fück critically discusses the works of Torrey and Ahrens (see²⁶ and²⁷) and, in opposition to their views, stresses the pre-Islamic origins of Muhammad's fundamental ideas. Neither to Judaism nor to Christianity does he assign any decisive influence on the genesis of Islam. There is much to be said in favour of this view but it does not take sufficient account of the many direct borrowings of Islam from either of the two monotheistic religions. Nor does Fück explain why Muhammad, though urged by genuine and independent religious impulses and experiences, in an Arabian setting, borrowed from Judaism and Christianity in the course of his prophetic career, while moulding his new religion. But this criticism of Fück's views in no wise invalidates his just and proper emphasis on Muhammad's religious genius and on his powerful personality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For a full discussion of all the problems raised in the paper and for more details on the various points, the reader who desires further information may be referred to the relevant articles in

Encyclopaedia Judaica, iv, viii, x for a general estimate and to all volumes under the headings of Biblical personalities.

The Jewish Encyclopaedia, especially vol. vi.

The Legacy of Islam, *The Legacy of Israel*, *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

R. Levy, *The Sociology of Islam*, London, Herbert Spencer's Trustees, 1931 and 1933.

A full bibliography is supplied in the *Enc. Jud.*, of which a few books may be mentioned here, except those referred to in the paper:

- A. Geiger, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen*, 1833, new impression, 1902. An English translation has recently been made of this work, I believe, in India.
- J. Schapiro, *Die haggadischen Elemente im erzählenden Teil des Korans*, 1907 (deals only with the Joseph-Sura).
- D. Sidersky, *Les Origines des Légendes Musulmanes dans le Coran et dans les vies des Prophètes*, Paris, 1933.
- J. J. Rivlin, *Gesetz im Koran, Kultus und Ritus*, Jerusalem, 1934.
- H. Speyer in *Korrespondenzblatt des Vereins zur Gründung einer Akademie*, 1923/4; and *Die biblischen Erzählungen im Koran*, 1932.
- J. Leveen. "Mohammed and his Jewish Companions" in *J.Q.R.* (N.S.), xvi, 399 sqq.
- B. Heller. Numerous articles in *R.E.J.* and *M.G.W.J.*, the references of which may be looked up in the *Enc. Jud.* s.v. "Koran", "Islam", "Abraham", "Isaak", etc. See also recent and current vols. of *R.E.J.* and *M.G.W.J.*, especially *R.E.J.* 1934, Nos. 193-4, pp. 1-18, *La Légende Biblique dans l'Islam*, etc., with bibliography.
- Articles by Bergsträsser, Goitein, Horovitz, Schacht, Goldziher in *O.L.Z.*, *Der Islam*, *Z.D.M.G.*, *J.Q.R.*, *R.E.J.*, *M.G.W.J.*, *H.U.C.A.*. See also S. D. Goitein, 'Inyārīm Yehudhiyyim b'Sefer 'anṣab al-'Ashraf shel Beladūri, in *Siyyon* i, fasc. 1, pp. 75-81: also his 'Israiliyyāt in *Tarbiṣ* vi, fasc. 1, 89-101 [I regret that I have not been able to obtain this instalment] and fasc. iv, 510-22. Both are very important studies.

Periodicals quoted:

H.U.C.A.: Hebrew Union College Annual.

Der Islam.

J.Q.R.: Jewish Quarterly Review (Old and New Series).

M.G.W.J.: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums.

O.L.Z.: Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.

R.E.J.: Revue des Études Juives.

Z.D.M.G.: Zeitschrift der Deutsch-Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.

I regret that I have not been able to consult a recent publication by the late Professor Bergsträsser, edited by J. Schacht, *Handbuch des Islamischen Rechts*, 1935.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER IV

¹ Sale's translation.

² W. O. E. Oesterley, *II Esdras*, Westminster Commentaries, 1933.

³ See, for a full discussion, Josef Horovitz, "Das koranische Paradies" in *Scriptia Universitatis atque Bibliothecae Hierosolymitanarum*, 1923, especially p. 7. V. Aptowitzer, "Die Pardiesesflüsse des Kurans" in *M.G.W.J.* LXXII, 151f., and both authors in *H.U.C.A.* vols. II and VI.

⁴ See *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, VIII, s.v. "Islam" and X, s.v. "Koran".

⁵ On this title see A. Marmorstein in *The Holborn Review* for July 1935, p. 365.

⁶ See M. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde*, Leyden, 1893. A wealth of material is collected here for all Biblical characters.

⁷ See Goldziher in *R.E.J.* xxviii, 78 sqq.

⁸ From *Enc. Jud.* X, s.v. "Koran", col. 319.

⁹ See Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, 2nd ed., Heidelberg, 1925, p. 61.

¹⁰ C. H. Becker, *Islamstudien*, vol. I, "Christentum und Islam" and "Die Kanzel im Kultus des Islam".

¹¹ In *J.Q.R.* (N.S.) IV, 641 sqq.

¹² Cp. Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* pp. 17 sqq.

¹³ Bukhari, *Salat* I, see *Enc. Isl.* s.v. "Salat".

- ¹⁴ So also Friedländer, *loc. cit.*
- ¹⁵ Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* p. 6 sq.
- ¹⁶ Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* p. 16 sq.
- ¹⁷ Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* p. 18.
- ¹⁸ Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* p. 21.
- ¹⁹ Mittwoch, *loc. cit.* p. 25.
- ²⁰ See vol. I, pp. 167 sqq.
- ²¹ Cp. Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, 2nd ed. p. 78.
- ²² *Aboth*, II, 5.
- ²³ *Enc. Jud.* x, s.v. "Islam".
- ²⁴ Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islam*, 2nd ed. p. 70.
- ²⁵ See the résumé in *Enc. Jud.* x, s.v. "Koran".
- ²⁶ So C. C. Torrey in his *Jewish Foundations of Islam*.
- ²⁷ So Tor Andrae in his *Der Ursprung des Islams u. d. Christentum*, 1926; see also W. Ahrens, *Muhammad als Religionsstifter*, Leipzig 1935.

ADDENDA

P. 173. [“The *Halakhah* is according to the School of Hillel except in six instances where the *consensus* of the *Hakhamim* decided according to neither school and except in three instances where the view of the school of Shammai prevailed” (*Introd. to the Talm.*, by Samuel han-Naghidh, towards end; in the Berlin Talm. of 1867, *Berakhoth* volume, the passage will be found on f. 124 b). See also the citation from *Sedher R. Amram*, in *Tosafoth*, *Šukkah*, f. 3 a top, s.v. *de-amar*, and rest of *Tos.*, ib.]

P. 179. [Compare the list of parallels in *P.B.S.* p. 5; *P.B.G.* p. 6; and in the *Tosefta* (Z. p. 18).]

CHAPTER V

FRANCE IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

BY
L. RABINOWITZ

CHAPTER V

FRANCE IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

The thirteenth century stands out as one of the most important periods in the history of Europe. A new economic system was being created, which was intimately connected with the rise of commercial towns and the growth of the power of the burghers, with the consequent decline of the Feudal system. In addition to this, the century was marked by the growth of the power and influence of the Church, notably under the Papacy of Innocent III, and the middle of the century saw that power at its climax. In the past, Bishops and Popes had often befriended and protected the Jews: this policy was now often changed.

As a consequence of these two facts, this century also marks a decisive turning point for the worse in the history of the Jews, and the decline of their position in European society dates from this time.* The new economic system which was being built up, and the rise of commercial towns, created disastrous economic competition for the Jews, against which it was impossible to contend, while the policy of the Church aimed at degrading them ruthlessly from holding a

* For a discussion of this see *C.A.J.* pp. 1-3. Except for the massacres of the Jews of Rouen during the First Crusade, and various minor incidents, such as the attack on Jacob Tam in the Second, the Jews of France hardly suffered from the Crusades which brought such hardships to the Jews of Germany. After the Second Crusade, the Jews of Germany became "*servi camerae*", whereas in France they still had their liberty. The Gilds took their cue from the Church.

recognized position in European society and reducing them to an unwanted and despised element, soon to be cooped up in ghettos, denied the light of day and the light of culture.

It is a remarkable fact, which might be construed almost as a kind of providential reply on the part of the Jews, that it was just at this period that the first literary contacts of any value were made between Judaism and the Church, and in divers ways and by devious routes the products of Jewish thought and Jewish intellectual accomplishments forced their way upon the thought of the Christian world. It took two centuries before the full harvest of this contact was reached, in the stirring times which preceded the Reformation. That it was so long delayed was due, not to the paucity of contact, but to the fact, that, as Hirsch rightly remarks in his essay on Roger Bacon,¹ "a complete revolution in thought, and a considerable increase of general knowledge was required to prepare the way towards an improvement in that direction".

The present lecture is limited to a consideration of the contact between Judaism and Christianity in France, because of one fact which emerges with unmistakable clarity from a consideration of the general question, and that is the dominant and well-nigh exclusive part in the dissemination of Jewish thought played by the University of Paris, founded at this time; its teachers were drawn mostly from the two great mendicant orders, the Franciscans, founded in 1209, and the Dominicans, in 1215.

The University of Paris first received formal recognition in 1211, when a Brief of Innocent III empowered it to elect a proctor to be its representative at

the Papal Court. This was far from implying episcopal recognition, its early history exhibiting it in continual conflict with the Chancellor, the Bishop and the Cathedral Chapter of Paris, all of whom regarded it as a centre of insubordination and doctrinal licence. At the same time, the impetus given to intellectual movements cannot be over-estimated, and throughout one's studies on this subject, the University of Paris emerges as the channel whence flowed the waters of the "sea of Talmud", to employ a Talmudic metaphor, into the sea of Christian thought.*

The lecture naturally falls into two major divisions, the influence of Judaism upon Christianity, and of Christianity upon Judaism, but a clear distinction must be made between the difference in scope between the two halves, for, whereas the influence of Judaism upon Christianity is the influence of Jewish literary studies, of thought and of thought systems upon the development of Christianity, it seems to have been a "one-way traffic only". Except in the case of what cannot be ranked higher than a subculture, in the influence of Christian superstition upon Judaism, which will be treated briefly in the course of this paper, there is no comparable balancing influence, and the influence of Christianity upon Judaism will be treated from an

* For a period subsequent to the one under consideration, the following is of interest: "L'étude des langues Grecque et Hébraïque n'a jamais été absolument négligée dans l'Université [sc. de Paris], quoiqu'elle n'y ait pas toujours été cultivée avec un soin égal. Nous avons sous cette année, 1430, une conclusion de la Nation de France qui veut que l'on pourvoie de bénéfices suffisans des professeurs de Grec, d'Hébreu et de Chaldéen, afin que ces langues puissent être enseignées à Paris" (M. Crevier, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris*, Paris, 1761, iv, 46). It is pleasing to recall that Paris was in English hands from 1420 till 1436!

entirely different standpoint, viz. from the sociological point of view, the effect of the social environment upon the life of the Jews and the development of the Pharisaic tradition, a subject of considerable sociological and literary importance.

I. THE INFLUENCE OF JUDAISM UPON CHRISTIANITY

This subject can be conveniently classed under five heads:

- (1) Bible.
- (2) Biblical exposition.
- (3) Scholasticism.
- (4) Cabbala.
- (5) Superstition.

Bible. The thirteenth century witnessed a noteworthy activity in its attempts to correct the incredibly corrupt texts of the Vulgate.² In 1227, there appeared the University Bible, then came the *Correctorium Parisiense*, about the same time; then, in 1236 and 1248, the Dominican Version of the Vulgate, the author of which has been established as Hugo de St-Clair, and which often quotes the *Hebrei*. This Bible, known as the Bible of Sens, was forbidden in 1256.

The division of the Bible into chapters, which approximate much more closely to the pericopes of the Hebrew Bible than did the often absurd divisions before, was the work of Stephen Langton (d. 1228), later Archbishop of Canterbury, but, at that time, one of the most celebrated theologians of the University of Paris. There can be no question but that this revival of interest in the Bible was closely connected with the spread of knowledge of Hebrew among Christians,

occasioned by their contacts, friendly and otherwise, with the Jews. Sens, Evreux and Paris were the seats of important Jewish schools, the fruits of whose work, the *Tosaphoth*,^{*} are still studied by Jews. From Jewish sources, notably from Yehiel of Paris,³ we know that the Jews were forced to teach Hebrew to Christians, and, on the other hand, Samuel b. Me'ir, commonly known as Rashbam, shows his acquaintance with the Latin Bible. But the evidence from the Christian side is much more conclusive, and the fate of the different versions of the Vulgate can well be studied with reference to the extent to which the correctors were dependent upon Jewish sources.

Thus the reason for the prohibition of the Bible of Sens in 1256 is to be found in the attack upon its redactor by the anonymous compiler of the *Correctorium Vaticanum*, almost certainly a pupil of Roger Bacon. He had a knowledge of the Targum, he quotes Rashi's commentary under the name of *perus*; he cites the Rabbis and he had read Matthew in Hebrew. While agreeing with St Jerome that where there is disagreement between two texts, *ad hebraicam configimus veritatem*, he attacks, in no measured terms, those who, like Hugo de

* The reader who is unfamiliar with Rabbinic terms must be reminded of the difference between the *Tosefta*, which has often been cited before and which may, very roughly, be described as a parallel to the Mishnah (see Translations, p. xix) and the *Tosafoth*, which, together with their authors, the *Tosafists*, will be mentioned frequently in this chapter. The word *Tosefta* is Aramaic and means "Addition"; possibly the correct form should be the plural, *Toseftha*. *Tosafoth*, which is Hebrew, also signifies "Additions": the term denotes the *additamenta* to Rashi's Talmudic commentaries by his disciples and successors, and are in the nature of critical and emendatory glosses. In Liber's *Rashi* (see below, p. 196*), there is an excellent map showing the towns of most of the *Tosafists*.

St-Clair, correct the Latin on the sole authority of the Hebrew, and most significantly he adds, "Take heed lest you pay too much attention to the Jews" (*Non nimis adhereas Judeis*), and the prohibition of the Bible of Sens was due to this fact. The author had committed the enormity of relying too much upon the original Hebrew!

It is not to be assumed that the corrected texts were, in fact, correct. There was, as we have just seen, too much prejudice against the Hebrew text, and too much reverence was paid by the correctors to the hallowed mistakes of their predecessors to make a thorough revision possible. It was, in fact, not a correction to arrive at the original, but a correction of the corrupted text of St Jerome's Vulgate, and this fact vitiated any attempt to arrive at a corrected text. Roger Bacon,⁴ who was at least two centuries ahead of his time in his appreciation of the importance of the study of Hebrew, who sought the aid of the Jews of northern France in his studies of the language of the Bible, and who realized, as no Christian at the time realized, the inability of the Jews of northern France to teach grammar efficiently, and in a methodical and rational manner, complains bitterly to Clement IV about the corrupt state of the University Bible. But what is beyond doubt is that the contact of Jews with Christians brought about an added knowledge of Hebrew, which gave the impulse to, and is reflected in, the corrections of the Bible undertaken in Paris in the thirteenth century.

Bible Exposition. The influence of the rational Biblical exegesis of the Jews of northern France upon Christian thought and Bible study was, in its results, undoubtedly the most lasting and enduring of the contacts between

Judaism and Christianity in France, paving the way, as it did, for the Protestant Reformation.

A short review of the growth of this rational biblical exegesis in northern France will not be out of place. Before the time of Rashi (1040–1105), we find, neither in France nor in Germany, any literal expositors of the Bible. Rashbam, the grandson of Rashi, indeed states explicitly in his commentary on Gen. xxxviii, 1, "our predecessors, in their piety, cultivated homiletical expositions, and were never trained to search out the real meaning of the text".

With Rashi, the prince of Jewish commentators, there commences a new epoch in the study of the Scriptures by the Jews. It is true that he indulges, to a considerable extent, in homiletical and aggadic explanations,* and that neither he nor any member of the French school attained that formal knowledge of grammar which marked the Spanish school. Yet not only is a large part of his commentary strictly scientific and in accordance with the spirit of the Hebrew language, to which he was more sensitive than any other commentator, but the impetus which he gave to his contemporaries and successors is incalculable,† and

* This, however, is not inconsistent with the statement (p. 203 below) that Rashi was a pioneer of *Peshat*. He was the first to pay attention to the literal meaning, carefully differentiates on numerous occasions between *Peshat* and *Aggada*, and often, after giving the literal meaning, dismisses the *Aggada* with the words "And our Rabbis have explained what they have explained".

† Rashi's influence was not limited to ecclesiastical circles: his Bible-commentary became a household book in most Jewish homes. It was certainly so used in England in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and this use was the ultimate origin of Shakespeare's choice of the name Jessica, in the *Merchant of Venice*; see *S.C.B.M.* II, note 1260, pp. 270 and footnote.

is to be placed entirely to his credit. Rashbam, whose biblical commentary is marked by a simplicity and accuracy which establishes it as the high-water mark of the exegesis of the northern French school, whose commentary is as terse as his Talmudic commentaries are prolix, states that his grandfather confessed to him in his old age his regret at having introduced so many aggadic elements in his commentary—a regret which posterity does not share—and his desire to rewrite it more in accordance with the needs of a rational exegesis.*

The commentary of Joseph Kara, a younger contemporary of Rashi, is marked by a scrupulous attachment to the literal meaning, and by a freedom from theological bias, which is remarkable for his age. Among the other successors of Rashi may be mentioned Joseph Bekhor Shor and Eliezer of Beaugency, both of whom distinguish themselves by a careful regard for the literal meaning of Scripture. Geiger† rightly says that the school founded by Rashi was superior to the Spanish school in their profound investigation of the spirit of the language, in a clear grasp of the detailed

* Rashi's biblical commentaries are readily accessible to the non-Hebraist, since various translations exist. First and foremost is the Latin translation, with ample notes, of J. F. Breithaupt, Gotha, 1710. This work, in six volumes, covers the Bible: it takes cognizance of super-commentaries. The whole of the Pentateuch is contained in Rev. M. Rosenbaum's recent translation (together with Hebrew text of Rashi and of the Bible), London (Shapiro, Valentine and Co., 1928–35). But for students who have learnt some Hebrew already, J. H. Loewe's interlinear annotated translation of Rashi on Genesis (Bagster, 1928) will be found of great utility.

There is a good (French) biography of Rashi by M. Liber, Eng. trs. Adèle Szold, *Jew. Hist. Soc. of Engl.* London, 1906.

† *Parschandatha*, Leipzig, 1855, p. 10.

contents of a book, and in a general and critical insight into the ideas and conceptions of antiquity. Ironically enough, the dissemination of this rational exegesis among Christians, which was rightly viewed with so much apprehension by the Church, was fostered by the disputations into which Christians forced the Jews to enter at this time, and the purpose of which was to prove to the recalcitrant Jews the truths of Christianity.

The Jewish expositors spared themselves neither in frankness nor in severity in pointing out refutations of Christianity. Joseph Bekhor Shor, in his commentary on the incident of the Golden Calf, adds "and so the Christians scoff at us for having made one idol, while they themselves daily worship innumerable idols".* Rashbam, who knows the Vulgate, takes every opportunity of pointing out "here is a refutation of *Minim*",† i.e. Christians, while on the lighter side may be quoted the comment by the former, Why did God appear to Moses in a lowly bush? Because had it been in a tree with a trunk, the Christians would surely have seen in it the symbol of the Cross!

The most famous name in connexion with the infiltration of this exposition into Christianity is that of Nicholas de Lyra,‡⁵ who so slavishly follows Rashi, that he was dubbed, somewhat irreverently, *simia Salomonis*, "Rashi's ape". Nicholas de Lyra, 1292–1340, was born

* On this see above, p. 136. His controversy over Isa. LIII, recorded by Joseph b. Nathan, may be seen in S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, *Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah*, Oxford, 1877, II, 71.

† For the term see above, p. 130.

‡ Reference should be made to Adalbert Merx's *Die Prophetie des Joel und ihre Ausleger*, Halle, 1879, especially to the following chapters: v, (a) *Geschichte der Auslegung: Das Lateinische Mittelalter*, (c) *Vereinigung Jüdischer und Christlicher Exegese*; viii, *Nicholas de Lyra*; x, *Die Theorie des Prophetismus bei de Lyra, Aquinas, Maimonides*, etc.

at Lyre, near Evreux, a centre of Talmudic studies and the seat of an important Jewish community. He studied at Paris, and taught at the Sorbonne till 1325. He had such a knowledge of Hebrew that he was thought by some to be a converted Jew. He was the first, in his *Postilla Litteralis*, to emphasize the importance of the *sensus litteralis*, and he endeavoured to apply it to the exclusion of all others. The fact that his exegesis is dominated by his polemics against the Jews does not affect his dependence upon them. He himself says, "I usually follow Rabbi Salomin, whose teachings are considered authoritative by Jews". His fidelity to the literal meaning, his comparison with the Hebrew text, his very independent attitude towards traditional interpretation, as well as his remarkable historical and critical sense, are due mainly to his direct use of Jewish commentators. The plural is deliberate. So far, the influence of Rashi alone on Lyra has been studied, notably by Siegfried, but it is evident from his own words that he drew upon others. He says, *Intendo non solum doctorum catholicorum, sed etiam hebraicorum explicaciones maxime Salomin*, implying that he used others as well, and a detailed examination of Lyra's use of other Jewish commentaries would well repay the effort.

Naturally Lyra is not a star set in splendid isolation. William of Mara, the author of the *Correctorium Vaticanicum* which has already been mentioned, Roger Bacon himself, could both be cited in evidence as to the knowledge of the rational school of French exegetes among Christians,* but there is a much more cogent item of

* As regards English Christians, reference should be made to the Presidential address of S. A. Hirsch, in 1909, to the Jewish Historical Society, published in their *Transactions* (vol. vii,

evidence as to the influence of these studies, and that is in the apprehension with which the Church authorities viewed the possible attraction which rational interpretation of the Scripture might have for the people, with consequent weakening of their Catholic faith. Thomas Aquinas,* of whom more later, who made extensive use of Maimonides, stated his view that intercourse with Jews should be forbidden to the unlearned, lest they be perverted to Judaism. Innocent III, in a letter to the Abbot and Convent of St Mary de Pratt in Leicester, on 5 December 1199, writes,⁶ "The more the people affected by Jewish blindness attends to the superficial meaning of Divine Scriptures...the more it persists in its obduracy and permits itself to remain in the darkest shadow", while the Council of Paris in 1213 re-enacted the prohibition against Jews employing Christian servants "lest, through the superficial plausibility of

London, 1915, pp. 1 sqq.). In this masterly account of the Christian knowledge of Hebrew during this period, Hirsch describes the *Isagoge* of Odo and gives an illustration (p. 9) of the unique MS. in Trinity College Library. On p. 10 he gives an illustration of Henry Cossey's (or, Costessy's) *Expositio super Psalmos*, also unique, which is in Christ's College Library.

Hirsch's article deserves careful study: his edition, with Father Nolan, of Bacon's Hebrew Grammar, should likewise be noted.

New information may be expected from a Hebrew Psalter, with a Latin interlinear translation, *marginalia* and grammatical appendixes. This book comes from Bury St Edmunds, where, until 1190, there was a flourishing Jewish community: a leaf from a Bury *Selihoth* liturgy is in Pembroke College Library (see M. Abrahams' description, in *Jews' College Jubilee Volume*, London, 1906, pp. 109 sqq.). This psalter may well have been written at Bury: the scribe of the Hebrew was certainly a Jew. But the Latin was composed and written by a Christian, and by one whose knowledge of Hebrew was considerable. An edition is contemplated by H. Loewe and H. L. Pink.

* See below, p. 204.

their law, which they wickedly pretend to explain, they may lead into the pit of their disbelief the Christian servants who dwell with them".⁷

There is additional evidence of the custom, even among the common people (in England), of consulting the Jews, in the decree of the Council of Worcester, in 1246, reproving "such as consult Jews for the purpose of finding out by magic about their life or actions".⁸

It is therefore by no means improbable—to say the least—that the reformation of Wycliffe* in England was indirectly influenced by the spread of knowledge of the Scripture, but of the influence of Lyra upon Luther, and so upon the Reformation, there can be no question. This subject will be treated fully by a subsequent lecturer, and I will therefore content myself with stating that the couplet *Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset*, with its variant *Si Rashi non scribasset, Lyra non lyrasset*, combine to establish the influence of the French exegetical school upon the Reformation, or, as it has been expressed, Rashi and the Tosaphists made Nicholas de Lyra and Nicholas de Lyra made Luther. Reuchlin, the father of the Reformation, states: "Und wann die Worten und Reden, des Rabbi Solomonis, der über die Bibel geschrieben hat, uss unserm Nikola de Lyra, der auch über die Bibel geschrieben hat, cantzelliert und ausgethan werden, so wolt ich das überig, so desselbe

* It may also be noted that Jews protested against miraculous cures effected at shrines. For such an incident at Oxford (c. 1180), see p. 282 of Neubauer's *Hist. of Oxf. Jews in Collectanea*, II, Oxf. Hist. Soc. 1890. It is said that these incidents provoked the coming of the Friars to convert the Jews, were one of the causes of the antagonism of the Church at the consequent Blood Accusation, and gave the impetus to the Wycliffite attack on cures at shrines.

Nicholas de Lyra aus seinem eygen haupt über die Bibel gemach hatte gar in wenig bletter comprehendieren und begreiffen."

It is a far cry from the literary activity among the Jews of northern France at the beginning of the second Christian millennium to that imperishable monument of English prose, the Authorized Version,* of which Macaulay truly said, "The English Bible is a book which, if everything in our language should perish, would alone suffice to show the extent of its beauty and power", "It lives in the ear like music that can never be forgotten"—yet the connexion can be traced, link by link, surely and unmistakably, albeit indirectly.

A great amount of the lavish praise which has been showered upon the "translators" of 1611 should properly be diverted to William Tyndale, the quatercentenary of whose martyrdom we celebrate this year. "The history of our English Bible begins with the work of Tyndale" says Dr Westcott in his *History of the English Bible*, and so far as the special genius of the A.V. can be ascribed to one man, that man is Tyndale. The influence of his translation, the first from the original Hebrew † and Greek, upon that of King James is paramount and unmistakable, and his simple and dignified prose, which was the basis of the work of the revisers, was alone instrumental in saving the version from the besetting literary sin of the age—ornate, florid and stilted language. As A. W. Pollard says,‡ "The

* On Kimhi and the A.V., see above, p. 12.

† For Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew see below, p. 220, *Addendum*.

‡ *The New Testament, translated by William Tyndale, 1525, with an introduction, by A. W. Pollard, Oxford, 1926, Introduction,*

Authorized Version of 1611, alike in language, rhythm and cadence, is fully 90 per cent Tyndale", and in a recently published article by one who has given particular attention to the study of rhythm in poetry and prose (Jacques Cohen, *English Rhythymical Prose and the English Bible*, London 1936), it is shown how perfectly the cadences of the Hebrew are retained in the English version.

Tyndale was almost certainly stimulated by Luther during his stay in Hamburg and Wittenberg, as Luther was influenced by De Lyra, who so slavishly followed Rashi.

The passionate desire to establish the correct literal meaning of Scripture without theological bias, despite the persecution of the Catholic Church, and in face of contumely and obloquy, which is so well reflected in Tyndale's declaration shortly before his death, "I call God to record...that I have not altered one syllable of God's word against my conscience", his dream of popularizing Scripture which he expressed in the famous words to his opponent, "if God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough shall know more of Scripture than thou dost", are characteristic of all those personalities and found their inspiration in the work of the northern French school of Jewish exegetes, whose influence has thus persisted to this day.

It is an elevating thought that martyrdom and obscurantism were of no avail in obstructing the

pp. xxi: cf. *Introduction to the Holy Bible*, 1611, An Exact Reprint, etc. Oxford, 1911, p. 8, and H. Guppy: 1. *William Tindale and the earlier Translators of the Bible into English*, Manchester, 1925. 2. *A Brief Sketch of the History of the Transmission of the Bible etc.*, Manchester, 1936, pp. 21-45, especially pp. 37-8.

channels through which the Divine Record should reach the people. "Great is Truth, and it shall prevail."

It is an interesting coincidence that the town of Worms was connected with three interpreters of the Bible. Rashi's chapel still survives in the town; a picture can be seen on p. 314 of the *Legacy of Israel*. Rashi, as has been stated, was the pioneer of *Peshat*, or simplicity in rendering. His Bible was in every sense a family Bible, for he wrote for the people.* Tyndale likewise aimed at *Peshat*, his renderings of *Cohen*, etc., roused the hostility of his opponents; Tyndale wrote for "every ploughboy", and it was at Worms, in 1526, that he completed his Testament. It was to Worms, in 1521, that Luther declared himself ready to go, "though there were as many devils there as tiles on the houses", but Luther's Bible was completed at Wartburg.

Scholasticism. Latin scholasticism, as a philosophical system, came to flower in the thirteenth century, roughly two generations later than the great period of Arabian thought upon which it depends, and it is no exaggeration to say that its florescence was due to the knowledge of the two great mediaeval Jewish philosophers, Solomon ibn Gabirol, known to Christians as Avicenna, and by many thought to be a Christian,⁹ the author of the *Mekor Hayyim*, *Fons Vitae*, and Maimonides. The centre of these studies was the University of Paris, whose teachers, as stated above, were drawn from the ranks of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, the former generally following Ibn Gabirol and the latter Maimonides. This subject has been treated fully

* See *S.C.B.M.* II, 269-70, for an example of Rashi's influence. It was for the simple folk that Rashi gave the Aggadic passages, mentioned above, p. 195.

in the *Legacy of Israel*,¹⁰ and it will suffice to give here but a brief sketch of the outstanding figures of thirteenth-century scholasticism, and the extent of their dependence upon Jewish authorities.

William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris in 1228, took an active interest in the University, and introduced Maimonides to Christian thought. Alexander of Hales, an Englishman, the *doctor irrefragabilis* of the University, shows a complete familiarity with the Latin translations of the *Fountain of Life* and the *Guide of the Perplexed* of Maimonides. The two greatest names however are those of Albertus Magnus (1193–1280), a German by birth, but lecturer at the University of Paris from 1245 to 1248, where he began to compile his great encyclopaedia. He was present at the Disputation which resulted in the burning of the Talmud at Paris in 1240. To him Isaac* and Maimonides are the two leading philosophers, and his whole system is based upon the latter. In his exposition of the nature of God, and his doctrine that it can be perceived only through His negative attributes; in his proof of Creation as against eternity, where he even quotes the words of Maimonides, and in other respects, he follows Maimonides closely, although he disagrees with his rationalist view of angels and prophecy.

The influence of Maimonides upon St Thomas Aquinas was even more marked. Thomas Aquinas was at Paris from 1245 to 1261 and from 1269 to 1272. In general, he is influenced by Maimonides in the same manner as Albertus Magnus, but to a greater extent.

* ISAAC ISRAELI, the earliest Jewish philosopher of the Latin West. c. 855–955. He was known to Christians as Isaac Judaeus. Lived at Kairouan. See *Legacy of Israel*, p. 187.

In his thesis of the nature of reason to revelation, in his treatment of the subject of the Divine attributes, God's knowledge, Providence and Omnipotence, in his proofs of Creation and his symbolization of biblical law, he relies upon Maimonides, and it was through him that the Maimonidean rationalization of the biblical view of sin and punishment passed into the Scholastic system.*

Cabbala. The keen and continued interest in this esoteric doctrine of the Jews, a true product of the Jewish mind, which has its roots in Talmudic literature, dates from Pico della Mirandola in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but Mirandola was anticipated by Raymond Lully,¹¹ 1225–1315, the celebrated *doctor illuminatus*, scholastic, metaphysician and chemist, who found in the letter and number mysticism of the Cabbala the foundation of his famous *Ars Magna*. It is true also that he was slightly influenced by the speculative Cabalists, but in so far as his system is built up on the number mysticism of *gematria*,† *noṭarikon* and *seruph*, which was in later ages practically ignored by the Jews, except as a species of mental acrobatics, he affords an interesting example of the oft-repeated phenomenon of the recurrent influence exercised upon

* This subject has been treated fully in the *Legacy of Israel*. Reference may also be made to the following:

(1) Jacob Guttmann's *Einfluss der Maimonidischen Philosophie auf das Christliche Abendland*, in *Moses ben Maimon*, I, Leipzig, 1908, pp. 135–230. An excellent treatment of the subject, with reference to sources.

(2) His *Die Scholastik des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zum Judenthum und zur Jüdischen Literatur*, Breslau 1902.

(3) His *Das Verhältnis des Th. Aquinas zum Judentum und zur Jüdischen Literatur* (privately printed? No date and place).

† See above, p. 12.

non-Jews by certain forms of Judaism that had but a slight effect upon the Jews themselves.

Superstition. This last aspect of the result of the contact between Jews and Christians in the thirteenth century I will touch upon but lightly. It might properly be ignored entirely, except that it forms a convenient link between the two parts of my lecture, in so far as it is the one influence which equally affected both. Christian superstitions found their way into Jewish literature and to a high degree influenced religious ceremonies, as did Jewish superstitions into Christian literature. The borrowing was indiscriminate. Hebrew words, especially mystical names of God, the meaning of which was not known to Christians, frequently occur in the great number of Greek and Latin charms, magical blessings and amulets of this period, and in the same way Greek and Latin words, whose import was unknown to the Jews, appear in Hebrew magical *formulae*. This, however, was far more common in Germany, where ignorance, both among Jews and Christians, was much more rife than in France.

II. THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON JUDAISM

With one exception, there is little traceable influence of Christian thought upon Judaism in France during the thirteenth century. That certain customs and enactments of Christians did find their way into Jewish life, especially with regard to marriage customs, is undoubted, but this can hardly be called the influence of culture, but rather of local custom. One point of influence is interesting, although it is doubtful whether it is more than a coincidence. Among the enactments

of R. Tam* is one to the effect that if a man strike another he should pay a fine of thirty dinars, but if he strike him in Synagogue, the fine is doubled. This finds a peculiar parallel in the earliest codification of English canon law, Aethelbert's *Doom*, in the latter half of the sixth century which reads, "The Church's Peace, two-fold fine". This is explained by Jenks to mean that the offender, in a quarrel in Church, must pay twofold, since the peace of the Church has been broken. It is possible that this Church law found its way, by devious means, into the law of the Synagogue, and no doubt many such parallels could be quoted. Thus it has been established that, in Spain, mutilation as a punishment for crime among Jews, which has no basis in Jewish law,† was a relic of ancient Visigothic law.

The question whether the enforcement of monogamy upon the Jews, first decreed by Rabbi Gershom, "The Light of the Exile", in the eleventh century, and re-enacted during our period, was due to the influence of Christianity is a moot point, which has given rise to considerable discussion. The point at issue is that although, theoretically, polygamy was permitted by Jewish law, there is overwhelming evidence to prove that, in practice, it rarely, if ever, existed in post-biblical times, and that even during Talmudic times, the presumption of the monogamous state underlies numerous laws. Abrahams, who has dealt with the matter fully in his *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*,¹² writes, "Jewish custom overrid Jewish law and established monogamy long before Christianity had made

* Jacob b. Me'ir Tam; born 1100, died at Troyes in 1171, a grandson of Rashi and the most distinguished of the Tosafists.

† On this see vol. I, p. 147.

the old Roman view on the question predominant in Europe".

And yet it is hard to deny some credit to Christianity for this legal innovation in Judaism. If monogamy were rigidly adhered to, there seems to be lacking the reason for introducing this decree which came to legislate for what was the universal practice, and the fact that it had to be re-enacted, and also one or two vague statements in the Rabbinical literature of the time, point to the fact that cases of polygamy did occur. In any case, it is almost impossible to resist the conclusion that a decree in a Christian country, whereby Jewish law was made to tally with Christian, was uninspired by it, and it gains greater credence by the peculiar fact that the rare exceptions permitted by the Rabbis of northern France were held also by the Church to allow similar licence, with negligible variations.¹³ But the influence of the contact with Christianity upon the development of the course of Judaism is much more profound and much more concrete than this, and it is in effect the result of the opposition always found between law and custom, which first came up as an acute problem in France during this period, and which had the effect of giving a flexibility and power of adaptation to the otherwise rigid standards of Judaism, which had a profound influence upon the development of orthodox Judaism, the legitimate child of Pharisaism, enabling it to adapt itself to changing circumstances.

The North-French scholars were the first to adapt the *Talmud* to the new circumstances of life which resulted from the Europeanization of Jewry and a Christian *milieu*. In fact, they did to the *Talmud* what the *Soferim* and *Tannaim* did to the *Bible*, and the same

problem arose. The task of the former was, how to make the laws of the Torah apply to circumstances for which it did not actually legislate; that of the North-French Rabbis, how the Talmud, compiled in a different environment, could be made to square with the new conditions of life (see vol. I, pp. 153, 175 n. 3). Ashkenazi Jewry was influenced infinitely more by the Tosafists, the North-French Rabbis, and the German school, than by Maimonides, as a reference to any Rabbinic work of the fourteenth-seventeenth centuries will show.

The Jews of northern France, from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries, formed a widely and sparsely distributed community throughout the length and breadth of France. There was hardly a village without its Jews, many had but single Jews resident in them, and the number of communities which numbered more than a hundred Jews was negligible. It is doubtful whether, apart from Paris, there was any. The same state of affairs prevailed in England during this period, and Joseph Jacobs¹⁴ gives us a list of the Jews in the different towns of England which exhibits the same phenomenon.*

To those Jews the Talmud was the norm and rule of life. In all things the Babylonian Talmud was considered as the authoritative expression of the Divine Will, by which alone they had to regulate their life and their conduct. They were uncompromising Talmudists,

* In this regard a comparison of the two maps in *H.J.E.* is instructive. The former, inside the cover, indicates the distribution of the Jews in the British Isles in 1928; the latter (p. 96), the distribution of the Jews of England before the Expulsion in 1290. In the first edition, where the distribution for 1907 is given, the contrast is even more striking. The 1290 map could be enlarged considerably, as more evidence becomes known of the residence of Jews in villages and country towns. Thus, the index to *S.C.B.M.* alone would put more places on the map.

and the Talmud was the sole outlet for their intellectual activities. Any other knowledge which they possessed, of surgery, astronomy, arithmetic and mathematics, was either derived from the Talmud, or acquired in order to make the Talmud intelligible, and in this they differ strikingly from the Jews of southern France and Spain of the same period. "The Jews of northern France had no knowledge of general culture, philosophy, astronomy, etc. Their strength lay in Bible and Talmud commentary", says Güdemann¹⁵ rightly, and "The genius of northern French Judaism [lay in its] devoted attachment to tradition" (*J.E.* v, 448).

Now the Babylonian Talmud was developed in Babylon where the manner of life of the Jews was diametrically opposed to that of the Jews of northern France during the period under review.* There, they lived in a compact mass, dependent largely upon themselves alone for their economic existence, and able to segregate their religious and social life, in a manner which was quite impossible in a sparsely distributed community, dependent for their livelihood upon the goodwill of their Christian neighbours and upon business relations with them. And in this way and for this reason, local custom grew up which was in direct opposition to the decisions of Talmudic law. Had they not been such uncompromising Talmudists, the tendency would have been to ignore Talmudic law when it clashed with the needs of their existence, since, as has been pointed out, "Custom has a superiority over law in the spontaneity of its appeal to our obedience.... Therefore a law which attacks a widespread custom, even though a majority support it, both lacks a ground

* See *A.L.*

of support which is essential to its effective operation, and creates a force of resistance which endangers its authority".¹⁶ And when we add to this psychological fact the force of economic pressure, the development of custom in opposition to Talmudic law would have endangered the authority of the latter.

Such a conclusion was an impossible one for northern French Jews. The Talmud must be justified, and a basis for harmonizing the opposing claims of law and custom must be found. Fortunately this basis was already in existence, in the keen realization by the Rabbis of the Talmud of the force of custom, and was embodied in such statements as "Custom annuls law",¹⁷ "Everything is dependent upon local custom",¹⁸ "Custom always precedes law",¹⁹ which are statements from the various parts of the Talmud chosen almost at random. This fact must be borne in mind, if we are to appreciate the otherwise casuistic manner in which the Rabbis of northern France harmonize the conflicting claims of law and custom. The procedure is nearly always the same. A Talmudic law is quoted, which is not obeyed by the Jews of northern France. The contradiction is rarely if ever commented upon in the words "Therefore our custom is wrong", but nearly always with the words "How can we justify this custom of ours in view of this law?" Rarely, indeed, do we find attacks on a "custom of folly",²⁰ and Tam says,²¹ "We rely upon custom, and whoever alters it, has to justify the alteration". And the utmost lengths of ingenious hairsplitting and casuistic dialectics are indulged in to square the two. But the basis of it is the well-defined and clearly demarcated path of Jewish law, advising a justification of custom wherever possible.

A consideration of the question will show clearly both the manner of approach and the influence upon Talmudic law. The prohibitions of the Talmud against associations with non-Jews belong to three categories.* First, and in a class by itself, stands the prohibition against using non-Jewish wine. So rigidly was this enforced that the touch of a non-Jew upon unsealed wine automatically rendered it unfit for Jewish consumption. Secondly, there is a list of prohibitions, for which various reasons are adduced by the Talmud, but the underlying motive of which is to exclude social and business relationships. These are:

- (1) Business dealings with Gentiles on their holy days.
- (2) Leaving an animal in the house of a Gentile.
- (3) Entrusting one's animals to the care of Gentile herdsmen.
- (4) Selling to them cattle, lambs or asses without an intermediary.
- (5) Employing Gentile nurses for their children.
- (6) Teaching them Hebrew.
- (7) Letting them houses.
- (8) Entering into partnership with them.

Thirdly, there came the natural prohibition against dealing in the appurtenances associated with, and used for, idolatrous worship. How were these prohibitions regarded in northern France, in view of the difference of social environment?

First, with regard to wine. Viticulture in all its branches was one of the chief occupations of the Jews of northern France. In this case, however, the possible invalidation of the wine, with the consequent material loss, made it a comparatively easy matter to enforce

* On this see above, p. 41 and vol. I, p. 114.

the Talmudic law rigidly. Nevertheless, it is evident from the many discussions on the matter that even in this case, there was continual encroachment upon the letter of the law. Various instances could be given, but the most significant is the fact that R. Tam remonstrated strongly against those who employed non-Jews to assist them in treading out the grapes in the vats, giving as their reason the desire "To obtain the favour of the Gentiles".*

It is when we come to consider the second and third categories, however, that the wide divergence between custom and law becomes evident. Every one of the prohibitions mentioned in the second category was not only disregarded, but their neglect was a daily occurrence. Flourishing business took place in the markets on Christian holy days, the sale of cattle to non-Jews was a daily occurrence; non-Jewish shepherds and herdsmen were employed; the widespread employment

* *Tosafoth* to 'Ab. Zar, f. 55 b; *Semag*, I, 36 d; *Haggahoth Maim.* to *Hilkh. Ma'akhaloth 'Asuroth*, xi, 11. The same rigidity existed in Moslem lands. Thus Obadiah of Bertinoro, who travelled in Egypt and Palestine in 1488-9, writes: "In all the districts through which I have passed, I have noticed that the law respecting wine is most strictly kept; there is even a doubt whether the honey may be used which the Arabs prepare from the grapes; it is very good, and, in preparing it, the grapes are not trodden in the same way as in making wine. I was asked to allow the use of it, for there are so many arguments in its favour. But my predecessors had not allowed it and I did not wish to make innovations [being a passing stranger]. There is not a single man who would drink wine that had been touched by an Arab, much less by an idolater."

This passage occurs in a description of the Karaites, but it must refer to the Rabbanites, for the Karaites would not have recognized Obadiah's Rabbinic authority.

For the English translation of Obadiah's letter, see p. 129 of *Miscellany of Hebrew Literature*, published by the Society of Hebrew Literature, London, 1872.

of Christian nurses and domestics gave rise to a vigorous protest by Innocent III; Jews let houses to Christians and entered into partnership with them. It is interesting to note the various justifications given by the authorities of northern France. Yehiel of Paris neatly turned the tables by adducing this fact as a refutation of the charges of Nicholas Donin, at the famous disputation at Paris in 1240, that the Talmud blasphemes and insults Christians. "Do we then apply the Talmud to Christians?" he says. "Go into the Jewish streets and see the business on Christian Festivals. Every day we sell them animals, we enter into partnerships with them, we give our children to them to nurse, we teach them Hebrew."²² He thus regards the laws applying to Gentiles in the Talmud as inapplicable to Christians, a view incidentally shared by Maimonides.* But this does not decide the question. Tam, in his dispute with Meshullam,²³ adduces them as a reason for not taking the Talmud literally. Moses of Coucy,²⁴ discussing the prohibition of dealing on Christian Festivals, gives, as the reason for its disregard, that Christians are not idolaters, and therefore limits the prohibition to Christmas and Easter alone. Yet even this modification of the restriction was not adhered to. R. Eliezer of Metz²⁵ gives as a reason that refusal to trade with Christians on their holy days will give rise to ill-feeling, but he admits the feebleness of his explanation, and

* Specimens of Maimonides' views about Christianity may be seen (translated) in *J.E.* iv, 56.

J. B. Levinsohn (*Zerubabel*, Odessa 1864, II, p. 89) gives a list of Talmudical commentators and *Posekim* (*Decisores*) who hold the view that Christians are not idolaters.

See the passages from *Tanna de Bebe Eliyyahu* cited in vol. I, p. 114.

concludes that a truly pious man will abstain from it.

A somewhat similar instance can be quoted, which refers to Norman England and which must be dated before 1184: it is cited from Jacobs²⁶ and it may be remarked that the manuscript there mentioned is No. 58 in Hirschfeld's catalogue and also that five lines from the foot of the second paragraph the correct reference should be to folio 72a. The source of the quotation is the *Tosafoth* of M. Elhanan and the passage runs as follows:

It is surprising that in the land of the isle (England) they are lenient in the matter of drinking strong drinks of the Gentiles and along with them. For the Law is distinctly according to those doctors who forbid it on the ground that it leads to intermarriage. But perhaps, as there would be great ill-feeling if they were to refrain from this, one must not be severe upon them.

The reason for the disregard of the law forbidding the employment of Gentile herdsmen is found in the fact that they are not suspect of immoral perversion with animals²⁷ as was the case in the time of the Talmud; an excuse for letting houses to them is found in the less authoritative Jerusalem Talmud,²⁸ and so on. But the very diversity and often forced nature of these explanations is, in itself, the proof that they were mere forced justifications, and Moses of Coucy, in the name of Isaac of Dampierre,²⁹ when speaking of the prohibition against selling animals to the Gentiles, comes much nearer the mark when he says, frankly, that these laws were enacted in the Talmudic period, when Jews dwelt together in compact masses, and could depend

upon one another, but now that they dwell scattered, the prohibition would entail too much sacrifice, and in view of this he limits the prohibition to the purchase of animals for the express purpose of reselling them to Christians. There can be no doubt that we have here an example of the natural tendency of the force of economic laws to overcome enacted law, even although that law has the halo of Divine sanction.

It is, however, when we come to the third category that this fact emerges most clearly, for, in this case, as in the case of the employment of Christian nurses, there is added to the Jewish prohibition the prohibition of the Church against Jews dealing in Church vessels as pledges. It is the main complaint of Innocent III to Philip Augustus in 1205,³⁰ and is otherwise frequently mentioned. Nor was the trade looked upon favourably by contemporary Jewish authorities. Graetz says that it is almost certain that an enactment was decreed forbidding it,³¹ and Eliezer of Metz,³² confining himself to the purely religious aspect of the question, very reluctantly permits it, saying, "One should consider the infinite reward of doing good as against the transient loss it entails, and abstain from benefiting from the appurtenances of idolatry, and it will be well with him."

Nevertheless, a flourishing and extensive trade went on which was, to a certain extent, connived at by local church officers.

But even this method of adjustment, extensive as it was, was not sufficient to legislate for the numerous problems which arose as a result of the changed and changing conditions of life. The problem arose, not so much of squaring and harmonizing the conflicting

claims of the economic needs of life with the letter of the law, as of legislating and enacting decrees for questions which arose, for which no provision was made in the Talmud, of prohibiting things which were permitted by the Talmud but which it was expedient to forbid.

It was in order to deal with these problems that there arose one of the most distinctive features in the history of northern French Jewry during this period. Rabbinical synods, at which were the heads of the Jewish community, met—normally for the sake of convenience at Troyes, during the great fairs held in Champagne—in order to pass new laws necessitated by changed circumstances. To give but one common example, the prohibition of R. Gershom, the first great Rabbi of Western Europe, who lived at the beginning of the eleventh century, against polygamy and divorcing one's wife without her consent, was amended and enforced. Multifarious were the regulations enacted, dealing with such varied subjects as the organization of the community, the disposition of a dowry in the case of the premature death of the young wife, a ban against the bearer of a letter opening the letter, regulations to prevent the enmity or ill-feeling of Christians, etc. These laws were made effective by the ban of excommunication pronounced against all those who transgressed the decisions of the Synod.*

In this case the influence of Christianity is more marked than in the previous, in so far as these synods were almost certainly based upon the idea of local and national councils in France at this time.

* For the foregoing, see L. Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1924, and the relevant portions (index, s.v.) of *J.L.*

Countless examples could be quoted, notably in the sphere of moneylending, to show how the change in social environment and in economic conditions brought about an adaptation and an adjustment of the letter of Talmudic law, and gave rise to new laws, and the influence of these adaptations was of incalculable influence upon the development and progress of Judaism. The decisions of the northern French school, mostly embodied in the *Tosafoth*, were regarded as authoritative, and where they justify a departure from Talmudic law, the law of the *Tosafists* was accepted. Their works became an integral part of Talmud study throughout Western and Central Europe, with the exception of Spain, and when the increasing persecutions of the Jews of Western and Central Europe drove them in their thousands over the border into Slavonic Russia and Poland, they brought with them the fruits of their studies. Even in Spain their influence was not unknown. Asher b. Yehiel, a pupil of Me'ir of Rothenberg and close in spirit to the *Tosafists*, brought it to Toledo, and his son Jacob, in his codification of Jewish law, the *Turim*, embodied many of their views. It was not so much in their actual decisions, as in their attitude towards the rival claims of Talmud and local needs, that their influence upon the development of Jewish law and thought is to be found, and it is due to the wholehearted adherence which they gave to the Talmud, while the Synods were the forerunners of many later assemblies, the most famous being the "Council of the Four Lands" (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries) in Eastern Europe.

Without them and their attitude, the Talmud might well have become outmoded and effete doctrine, in

view of the increasing divergence between the letter of its law and their way of life; they it was who showed the way of adaptation and adjustment. They prevented Pharisaic law from becoming rigid and stereotyped, unable to adjust itself to changing conditions and inapplicable to the position of Jews in the different countries of Europe. They were the most decisive factor, since the Europeanization of Jewry about the year 1000, in making possible the development of a progressive traditionalism, which has left the position of the Talmud unchallenged and enshrined in the hearts of millions of Jews as an authoritative code of life, despite certain details inapplicable in other times, a code able to meet changing circumstances of life. The impetus towards this orientation was not the result of theoretical disquisition, but the direct result of the successful solution by the Jews of northern France of the problems raised by the conditions of life and the environment in which they lived, the problem which the orthodox Jew has to solve in every age, and for which the way was pointed out to him by the Rabbis of northern France in the thirteenth century.

It was in this way that contact with Christianity in the thirteenth century decisively influenced the development of the ideas of Pharisaism.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER V

¹ S. A. Hirsch (essay on Bacon in) *A Book of Essays*, London, 1905, p. 15.

² S. Berger, *De l'histoire de la Vulgate*, Paris 1887, pp. 9–16, and *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie*, xvi, Lausanne 1883, pp. 41–66.

³ *R.E.J.* i, 258.

⁴ *J.Q.R.* (O.S.), xii, 34–88.

- ⁵ Siegfried, *Archiv f. Wiss. Erf. des A.T.* I and II, Halle 1867-8.
⁶ C.A.J. p. 97. ⁷ Ib. p. 307. ⁸ Ib. p. 331.
⁹ See below, p. 255*.
¹⁰ I. Abrahams, E. R. Bevan and Ch. Singer, *The Legacy of Israel*, Oxford, 1927, pp. 257-71.
¹¹ J.E. III, 470 foot; *Kab.* pp. 117-18; *Leg. of Isr.* p. 273.
¹² J.L. pp. 115-16. ¹³ Ib. p. 117. ¹⁴ J.A.E. p. 382.
¹⁵ M. Güdemann, *Gesch. d. Erziehungswesens*, Vienna, 1880, p. 14.
¹⁶ McIver, *Society, its Structure and Changes*, Toronto, 1931, p. 275.
¹⁷ T.J.Yeb. XII, f. 12c, lines 20 and 22 (French trs. S. VII, 169).
¹⁸ T.B. Bab. M. 110a (Germ. trs. G. VI, 880).
¹⁹ Tract. *Šoferim*, XIV, 18 (ed. Joel Müller, Leipzig, 1878, p. xxvi foot). ²⁰ *Tosafoth* to *Pes.* 51a top.
²¹ *Šefer hay-Yashar*, ed. Vienna, 1811, f. 43a, para. 441.
²² R.E.J. I, 258. ²³ *Šefer hay-Yashar*, para. 45, 5.
²⁴ *Semag* I, ed. Soncino, 1488, f. 10a, para. 45.
²⁵ *Tere'im*, para. 270. ²⁶ J.A.E. p. 269.
²⁷ *Tos. 'Ab. Zar.* III, I (*Z.* p. 463); *Tosafoth* to *'Ab. Z.* 22a, fin. Contrast the prohibition in the Mishnah *'Ab. Zar.* (Eng. trs. E. P. 29).
²⁸ *Semag*, ib. para. 48. ²⁹ Ib. ³⁰ C.A.J. p. 107.
³¹ *Gesch. d. Juden*, Leipzig, 1900, IV, 234.
³² *Tere'im*, para. 102.

ADDENDUM

P. 201. Mr D. Daiches, Fellow of Balliol, kindly allows me to cite the following from his letter: "With regard to your query about Tyndale's version of Jonah iv, 9, 'I am angrie a goode':—Coverdale has not got this: he has 'yee, very angry am I'. A.V. and R.V. have 'I do well to be angry'. Both are wrong, so is Tyndale. Coverdale, who alone knew no Hebrew, or almost none, is right, by a fluke. The Hebrew gives the clue. God asks Jonah *ha-hetebh harah lakh*, where *hetebh* is used in that common, idiomatic sense of 'very', 'exceedingly', 'Art thou exceedingly angry?' The American-Jewish version gets this right. Jonah replies *Hetebh harah li* 'I am exceedingly angry', *hetebh* again used in the same way. Tyndale, knowing some Hebrew, recognized the word *hetebh* and knew its literal meaning, but was puzzled as to what it was doing there. In the question, he translates merely 'Art thou angrie'. In the answer he tries to get in the sense of *hetebh*, with its connexion with 'good', 'well', *Tobh*. So he translates 'I am angrie a goode', where A.V. and R.V., equally wrong, have 'I do well to be angry'. That Tyndale had some knowledge of Hebrew can be clearly proved otherwise."

CHAPTER VI
THE FEUDAL PERIOD

BY
G. G. COULTON AND A. C. ADCOCK

N O T E

The sixth lecture, owing to difficulties with the stenographic report, represents very little of Dr Coulton's actual words. Many of the most important matters have thus been omitted, and a great deal of relevant matter from Jewish sources has been added. Dr Coulton, therefore, is responsible only for part of the non-Jewish historical matter in this lecture.

CHAPTER VI

THE FEUDAL PERIOD

A. THEOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Partly by G. G. COULTON

When I came to look through the Jewish documents on the doctrines which I wished to compare with Christian thought, I was surprised to find Jewish life more orderly, more modern, shall I say, in its civilization than I had realized; and I say this after making all allowance for the fact that the authorities are, in the nature of the case, mainly Jewish. I will also confess that when, at the "Society of Jews and Christians", a month ago,* I listened to Dr James Parkes' lecture on Jews and Christians in the Middle Ages, although there was, I suppose, no single incident that the hearers did not know already, still the mere rehearsal of the conflict between the Church and the Synagogue in those centuries made me feel, more deeply than ever before, that this chapter is one of the darkest in Christian history, and not one of the brightest in Jewish.

In surveying my documents, it seems to me, more and more, that we have in the relations of Church and Synagogue, roughly, the conflict between an older and a newer civilization; and, roughly again, a conflict between spiritual force and physical force, in the sense in which absolute non-resistance is the extreme assertion of spiritual force and the modern Nazi, Soviet and Fascist movements are the expression of extreme physical

* Dec. 1935.

force. I have to make this qualification in order to avoid misunderstanding of the comparisons and contrasts I shall try to draw. I do not think that the evaluation of what we usually call physical force and spiritual force is quite so easy as most people suppose. Neither of them is so definitely superior to the other as its advocates are apt to assume. The ideal lies in the Golden Mean.

Mediaeval Judaism was the inheritor of one of the oldest civilizations at that time existing. The Christian community, on the other hand, had roots also in the less developed and much younger Teutonic society—the society described by Tacitus, in which the people lived for the most part in separate villages; in which there was scarcely a tribe at all except in time of war; and in which the separate tribes could never arrive at complete national consciousness. In Teutonic society, the magistrates had no executive force but only a force of persuasion. All the village meetings, and even the tribal meetings, comprised the whole population and nominally resulted in a unanimous vote. But how a unanimous vote was obtained in the time of Tacitus he describes very plainly. People signified their disapproval by a hollow murmur, and their approval by a clashing of spears. That situation continued all through the Middle Ages. Theoretically, there was always unanimity in the votes, but the assent was purely formal and extremely vague. The business of the ruler was to build up an organized system of law which could be imposed on a scattered and heterogeneous populace. The only means of doing this lay in the liberal use of physical force until a more or less uniform cultural tradition had grown up.

As a result of the different roots of the two societies,

the Christians were subject to a temptation which did not beset the Jews. As Spurgeon once said to a meeting of the Baptist Church: "We have the honour to belong to the only great Christian body which has never persecuted." And when the storm of applause had died down, he added: "Because we have never been able to." This was exactly the position of the Jews in mediaeval society.* They had their cultural tradition which they had built up many centuries before; and they were living in the midst of a new and hostile civilization which was only then growing up; a civilization in which they had no chance of taking their proper part and in which they could do no more than preserve their own cultural and religious integrity. All that they could hope to contribute would be the appreciation of the value of spiritual force; while their inferior social position would naturally tend to make them advocates of toleration for religious and cultural minorities. In those parts of Europe where the roots of civilization were older, they succeeded, to some extent, and they became the pioneers of liberalism.

It is one of the most significant rules of European history that toleration for the Jews has gone hand in hand with free enquiry and secular liberty. Secular rulers who have favoured Jews have by the same token inclined towards liberal opinion. . . . This is evidenced in medieval countries nowhere more strikingly than in Languedoc, the home of heresy and Jewish prominence.¹

As Dr Lea, the historian of the Inquisition, has pointed out:

In no other Christian land did the despised Jew enjoy such privileges as in Languedoc. His right to hold land in

* But see footnote on p. 226 below, and vol. I, p. 189.

franc-alleye was similar to that of the Christian; he was admitted to public office, and his administrative ability rendered him a favorite in such capacity with both prelate and noble; his Synagogues were undisturbed; and the Hebrew school of Narbonne was renowned in Israel as the home of the Kimchis. Under such influences those who really possessed religious convictions were but little deterred from criticising the shortcomings of the Church, or from seeking what might more nearly respond to their aspirations. It was in such a population as this that the first anti-sacerdotal heresy was preached.²

The same was true, to a lesser extent, of Italy at the same period; and the denunciations of the Spanish monk, Lucas of Tuy, apply to the greater part of Spain. He writes:

Many heretics with a certain deliberate malice become circumcised, and under the guise of Jews, as if for the sake of disputing, come to Christians and ask heretical questions. Thus the Jews sow heresies more freely, though at first they did not dare speak the word of heresy. The secular heads and judges of the cities hear the doctrines of heresy from the Jews whom they number among their familiars and friends. If anybody, led by zeal for the law of God, exasperates any of them, he is punished as if he touched the pupil of the eye of the judge of the city. They teach other Jews to propose their blasphemies against Christians, in order that they can thus pervert the Catholic Faith. All the Synagogues of the malignant Jews have patrons, and they placate the leaders with innumerable gifts, and seduce the judges by gold to their own culture.*

* Lucas Tudensis, *De Altera Vita fideique controversiis adversus Albigensium errores*, ed. Mariana, Ingolstadt, 1612, pp. 189-90 (tr. J.I.C. pp. 140-1).

Cf. also the Chazar civilization where the Jews were even freer

In some ways the Jews approximated more to modern ethical conceptions than did a good many Christians of the Middle Ages. I will begin with *Humility*. It has recently been claimed by correspondents in *The Times*³ that humility was unknown to classical antiquity, and that it originated in Christendom. But Judaism, with Micah's "Walk humbly with thy God", certainly did not look to external sources for its doctrine of humility. It therefore adds to the significance of the relation between Christianity and Judaism that Christianity admittedly fused together the main strands of thought adopted from the Roman Empire, taking not only the best, but also inheriting some of the weaker points. Hence it rejected the Roman inheritance of imperial superiority, and adopted from Judaism the assurance that humility is a virtue. This is all the more significant since Christianity, in following the Jewish conception of humility, turned its back not only on its Roman, but also, so far as Teutonic Christianity is concerned, on its Teutonic past also. For it is an unquestionable fact that Teutonic society was a society built on personal pride.

But, however lofty the Christian praises of humility as seen in Bernard of Clairvaux, *De Consideratione*, and Thomas à Kempis, *Imitatio Christi*, they did not excel those of the Jewish philosopher Maimonides.

There are some dispositions, in regard to which man is forbidden to adopt the middle course, but should rather remove from one extreme to the other. This is the case with

(*vide Camb. Med. Hist.* iv, 190-1): they ultimately became the rulers and under this Jewish monarchy an "ideal tolerance" prevailed. Thus, the judiciary posts were equally divided among the three religions (*ib.*).

haughtiness of mind; because it is not the good way for a man to be merely meek, but to be of humble mind and exceedingly lowly of spirit. Therefore it is said of Moses our teacher that he was not just meek, but *very* meek (Num. xii, 3). Consequently the Sages exhorted us, "Be *exceedingly* lowly of spirit". They further declared, "Whoever makes his heart haughty denies a cardinal doctrine; for it is said, 'Then thy heart be lifted up and thou forget the Lord thy God'" (Deut. viii, 14). They also taught, "Whoever is possessed of haughtiness of spirit deserves excommunication".⁴

Moses Nahmanides (1195-1270) wrote a famous treatise on "The Virtue of Humility" (*Iggereith Musar*), addressed to his elder son Nahman. The treatise is edited and translated by Abrahams.*

Asher b. Yehiel, known, from the initials of the words Rabbenu Asher, as the Rosh, was born in Germany about 1250: he migrated to Spain, where he became Rabbi of Toledo, dying in 1327. He was distinguished for many works, among them, his *Hanhagah* or "Rule". In this he says: "Exalt not thyself over thy fellow-creatures, but be humble of spirit and like the dust on which all tread. Speak not insolence with a haughty neck (Ps. lxxv, 6), lifting high thy forehead, thereby rejecting the fear of heaven.... Retain not thine anger against a fellow-man for a single day but humble thyself and ask forgiveness.... Be not overbearing towards the men of thy city; yield to the wishes of others."† Judah, his son, who succeeded him as Rabbi of Toledo, died in 1349. He, too, speaks in his *Will* of humility, saying: "Cleave to humility, the best of good qualities.... The fear of the

* *H.E.W.* I, 95 sqq.

† *H.E.W.* I, 121-2.

Lord which Wisdom makes a crown to her head,
Humility makes the imprint of her foot.”*

Beautiful is the tone of a poem by the Jewish mystic Gabirol:⁵

Humble of spirit, lowly of knee and stature,
But in fear and awe abounding,
I come before Thee.

And in Thy Presence to myself appear
As a little earth-worm.

O Thou, Who fillest the earth and Whose greatness is endless,
Shall one like me laud Thee,
And how shall he honour Thee?

The angels of heaven do not suffice,
How then, one like me?

Thou hast wrought good and hast magnified mercies,
Wherefore the soul shall magnify praise of Thee.

But in one very important respect neither Judaism nor mediaeval Christianity was always really humble. However clearly humility might be preached to the individual,† sometimes both religions suffered collectively from the arrogance of ecclesiasticism. This arrogance frequently dictated the official doctrine of salvation; and the mediaeval Catholic doctrine, *Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus*, is one which gives the modern Roman Church considerable trouble, and leads to forced explanations. Nowadays, we are told, practically, that *extra* does not mean *outside*, *Ecclesiam* does not mean *Church*, *nulla* does not mean *no*, or *salus* *salvation*. The Jewish attitude to the Torah was often very similar to

* H.E.W. II, 177, from *T.J. Sabb.* I, § 5, 3 c, line 17 (French trs. S. IV, 17): other sources given in Abrahams' note *in loc.*

† On this, cf. the passage from *T.d.B.E.* p. 197, cited in vol. I, p. 115.

the Christian doctrine of the Church; for both religions professed to possess the only safe passport to salvation.

I will therefore state the technical and official Catholic doctrine and note some of the popular interpretations of it. St Thomas Aquinas leaves a bare possibility for the salvation of those who are not able to believe in the Incarnation. He is confronted, for example, with the case of John the Baptist. No one denies his salvation, and yet he seems to have had doubts about the Incarnation. Again, Dionysius states that "Many Gentiles have come to salvation".⁶ Then Saint Thomas⁷ explains that before the state of sin—in Paradise—Adam and Eve had implicit faith in the Incarnation. After the sin in Paradise, this faith was sometimes explicit but always indistinct, only growing more and more distinct as history came nearer to Christ. After the time of grace revealed, both old and young are considered to need explicit faith in the mysteries of Christ, or at least to be capable of such. "Those many" of Dionysius, who were saved, although they did not have explicit faith in the Incarnation, yet had a faith in Divine Providence, believing that God was the liberator of man. Yet, though there was a natural ecclesiastical tendency to say that only those who are members of the Visible Church and partake of her Sacraments show the required explicit faith in the Incarnation, a more liberal attitude was adopted by many, particularly by mystics like Piers Plowman and Juliana of Norwich. This liberal idea is well expressed in the words of the German mystic Rulman Merswin in the fourteenth century. Rulman besought God to have mercy on Christendom, as against "the evil Jewish folk and the evil heathen folk", and "all who

work against Thee and gainsay Thee with all their might, and who also shall all be lost". God's answer comes:

"I will tell thee thou art right to say that God should have mercy on poor Christendom; for know that, for many hundred years, Christendom hath never been so poor and so evil as in these days. But, whereas thou sayest that the evil Jewish folk and the evil heathen folk shall all be lost, that is not true: God hath, in these days, far more love for a part of the heathen and a part of the Jews than for many men who bear the Christian name, yet live against all Christian ordinances.

... When a Jew or a heathen, whosoever he be in the world, hath a good godly ground in himself, and is therewith single-hearted and honest, and is aware, in all his reasonable modesty, of no better faith than that wherein he is born, and is also resolved in his deepest heart and his whole will that, if he found another faith that was offered to his understanding, that was dearer to God than this wherein he was born, then he would bid farewell to that first faith, notwithstanding the peril of body and goods, so long as he were obedient to God—wheresoever a good Jew or heathen lived there in such great honesty of thought, tell me then, should not the one God love him far more than many evil and false Christians, who have received baptism, and know well that they do things contrary to God, and do them none the less? Not so doth the good Jew or heathen; he knoweth no better; if he knew better he would suffer death for God's sake to come to the better faith." Then said I: "Ah, dear Lord of mine, this saying to me is wondrous strange, and I will tell Thee how we find it in Holy Scripture, and it is also our Christian Faith, that no man may come to Heaven unless he be washed in holy baptism." Then said the Voice: "That also is true, and right Christian faith; but I will tell thee: when God findeth any so truly righteous and good heathen or Jew, what then doth God? He, who may not depart from His free love and His

bottomless pity, cometh to that man's help; He findeth many a hidden way against leaving righteous and godly folk to perdition, at whatsoever end of this wide world they may dwell.... This cometh to pass in many hidden ways, unknown to the multitude of Christians in these days; but I will tell thee of one way which may well be believed by Christians; when one of these good heathens or Jews cometh to his end, then God cometh to his help and enlighteneth him with Christian faith, so that the Christian faith is so beknown to him that he yearneth with all his heart for baptism: if then there be no baptism at hand, yet he yearneth thereafter from the bottom of his heart, then I will tell thee how God doeth: He himself goeth and baptizeth him for the sake of his desires and of his painful death. Thou shalt know that many of these good heathen and Jews are now in the life eternal, all of whom came thither in such wise as this.”⁸⁸

The great Jewish thinkers would have cordially agreed with this sentiment. Salvation for the Jew did not depend on sacramental rites but rather on the assimilation of the Torah, which would be regarded by many as the codification of the principles of right reason. All who act reasonably are therefore implicitly devotees of the Torah even if they have never read the Hebrew codification. The Torah can be called the one and only road to salvation only in the sense in which the principles of right reason are one. But one can be more or less reasonable and no one can be completely reasonable; so the existence of the one complete and true Torah does not militate against the salvation of those who are not acquainted with it in its entirety or who have not yet arrived at a very mature sort of obedience to its precepts, despite their sincere intention.

Judaism is therefore a religion of reason, and, as such, it is not exclusive. Salvation does not depend to

any extent on the conferring of *ex opere operato* grace which is impossible outside a certain society. This principle is clearly emphasized by Maimonides, who tries to show that the ordinances of the Torah are simply the dictates of right reason, and that it is simply a providential accident, historically speaking, that the Jews have these principles written down in their entirety.

There is a cause for every commandment; every positive or negative precept serves a useful object. In some cases, the usefulness is evident, e.g. the prohibition of murder and theft; in other cases, the usefulness is not so evident, e.g. the prohibition of enjoying the fruit of a tree in the first three years.... The reason of a commandment, whether positive or negative, is clear and its usefulness evident, if it directly tends to remove injustice, or to teach good conduct that furthers the wellbeing of society, or to impart a truth which ought to be believed either on its own merit or as being indispensable for facilitating the removal of injustice or the teaching of good morals.

The aim of obedience is the facilitating of good conduct in the world and the consequent training of the soul. There is no esoteric virtue attached to obedience, nor is there any condemnation for those whose principles do not quite coincide with those which Moses has written down. "The ordinances of the Torah are not an infliction on the world, but a medium of mercy, kindness and peace in the world." So far from condemning the good Gentile out of hand, Maimonides is certain that religions other than Judaism have their part in the history of the salvation of the human race. He was naturally prejudiced in favour of Judaism, and adopted the general view that the one religion is true

whereas the others are ingenious systems which claim many of its valuable features.

The desire of the other religions is to make their falsehoods resemble the Faith instituted by God; but the divine work cannot be like the handiwork of man except to a child who has no knowledge of either. The difference between our religion and the others to which it is sought to liken it, is none other than the difference between the living, sentient man and the image carved by the workman from wood, or moulded from such metals as silver or gold, or sculptured from a block of marble or other stone and shaped into human form.⁹

Despite this exclusive attachment to Judaism he was very tolerant to other religions, and although he regarded Jesus and Muhammad as false prophets in so far as their teachings were not in accordance with the commandments of the Torah, he was convinced none the less that the two daughter religions were instruments for the spreading of the teachings of Israel. He admitted in favour of the Christians that "they acknowledge that our Torah was given us from heaven by our teacher Moses (peace be unto him!), and it is regarded in its entirety by them as Holy Writ, though they at times interpret it wrongly".¹⁰ Of the Mohammedans he wrote:

They are in no way idolaters, and idol-worship has long since passed from their mouth and heart. They ascribe Unity to God as is proper, a unity without defect.... And if anyone should say that the temple which they praise is a house of idolatry and idol-worship is stored there [i.e. the Black Stone in the Kaaba] which their fathers used to worship; what if they do prostrate themselves before it to-day, so long as their heart is directed to Heaven!

Nor did he think that the only people who obey the Torah merely nominally are Gentiles: many of the Jews are more culpable than the Gentiles, and their nominal allegiance without reason will be of little avail to them.

Like Hillel who affirmed that "the ignorant man cannot be pious", Maimonides despised those men whose religion consisted in a blind, unquestioning performance of ritual without any rational basis to support it. In his *Ethical Will* which he addressed to his son, he warns him against intercourse with the Jews of certain districts: "because they are greater fools, in my estimation, than all other men, although they are extremely orthodox; but God being my witness, I regard them as no better than the Karaites who deny the Oral Law, since all their occupation with the Torah, Scriptures and Talmud is brainless."¹¹

The standards on which men will be judged are, therefore, good intention and reasonableness. Maimonides, who has since occupied in Judaism a place equal to that of Aquinas in Catholicism, cannot restrict salvation to members of the Synagogue.

You must know that the Merciful One demands the heart, and the criterion is the intention of the heart. Therefore the teachers of truth, our Rabbis, declared, "The pious of the Gentiles have a portion in the world to come", if they have attained what is due to them to attain, relative to a knowledge of the Creator, and have corrected their soul with the virtues. And there is no doubt about the matter that whoever corrects his soul with purity of morals and purity of knowledge in the faith of the Creator will assuredly be a son of the world to come. On that account our Rabbis stated: "Even the Gentile who occupies himself with the Torah of Moses is equal to the High Priest."¹²

Striking is the statement of Solomon ibn Gabirol, the philosopher-poet of Spain, in his "Royal Crown":¹³

Thou art the God of Gods, and the Lord of Lords,
Ruler of beings celestial and terrestrial,
For all creatures are Thy witnesses
And by the glory of this Thy name, every creature is bound
to Thy service.

Thou art God, and all things formed are Thy servants and
worshippers.

Yet is not Thy glory diminished by reason of those that worship
aught beside Thee,

For the yearning of them all is to draw nigh Thee.

Ibn Gabirol was born at Malaga in 1021 or 1022, Maimonides at Cordova in 1135. A third great Spaniard, who intervenes, was Judah hal-Levi, who was born at Toledo about 1085. The following extract from his *Cusari*, properly *Kitab al-Khayzari*, a philosophical work centering round the King of the Khazars who embraced Judaism (see above, p. 226 footnote), illustrates both the Jewish view of other religions as well as of the virtue of humility, discussed above:

...I see two antagonistic religions prevailing, although it is impossible that the truth should be on two opposite sides. It can be only on one or on neither. I have explained to thee in connexion with the verse: "Behold My servant shall prosper" (Isa. lii, 13), that humility and meekness are evidently nearer to the Divine Influence than glory and eminence. The same is visible in these two religions. Christians do not glory in kings, heroes and rich people, but in those who followed Jesus all the time, before His Faith had taken firm root among them. They wandered away, or hid themselves, or were killed wherever one of them was found, suffered disgrace and slaughter for the sake of their belief. These are

the people in whom they glory, whose ministers they revere, and in whose names they build churches. In the same way did the "Helpers" and friends of Islam bear much poverty, until they found assistance. In these, their humility and martyrdom, do they glory; not in the princes who boasted of their wealth and power, but rather in those clad in rags and fed scantily on barley bread. Yet, O Jewish Rabbi, they did so in the utmost equanimity and devotion to God. Had I ever seen the Jews act in a like manner for the sake of God, I would place them above the kings of David's house. For I am well aware of what thou didst teach me concerning the words: "with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Isa. LVII, 15), as well as that the light of God rests only upon the souls of the humble.¹⁴

Another subject which provides interesting contrasts is the attitude taken towards the Bible. Each religion is linked to a book. Formerly, however, before the formation of the Canons of the Old and New Testaments (at the beginning and end of the second century respectively) both religions admitted new material to their sacred literature and considered the additions as inspired. But the possession of a canonical Scripture naturally led to its supreme elevation in popular regard and sometimes stiffened into bibliolatry. This was softened for Judaism by Maimonides, of whose opinion several passages may be cited. Generally speaking, he was firmly convinced that a passage from Scripture should never be torn out of its context in order to support a theological doctrine, but should be studied as part of a complete work.

Know that it is not permitted anyone to take one word from a passage, the whole of which is closely connected, to use as an argument and a support; but it is proper for him

to study the context. That is to say, he should first study the word on which he intends to rely, from the beginning of the phrase—how it fits in there—to the end of the phrase; then he will know the intention of the speaker of the passage and he can extract proof from it. It is improper, however, to extract proof from a word which is torn from what precedes and follows.¹⁵

He was also certain that if the obvious and superficial meaning of a passage seems to contradict the main meaning of the book, it is the duty of the reader to admit that, for the moment, he does not understand the passage, rather than to twist the whole to fit in with the doctrine of the one part. It may well be that the meaning of Scripture is not superficial but is appreciated only by appeal to a “deeper sense”. And in his search for this “deeper sense” Maimonides often shocked his contemporaries by his boldness. He suggested, for example, that the first few verses of Genesis were not to be read literally.

The account given in Scripture of the Creation is not, as is generally believed, intended to be in all its parts literal. For if this were the case, wise men would not have kept its explanation secret, and our Sages would not have employed figurative speech in treating of the Creation in order to hide its true meaning, nor would they have objected to discuss it in the presence of the common people.* The literal meaning of the words might lead us to conceive corrupt ideas and to form false opinions about God, or even entirely to abandon and reject the principles of our faith.¹⁶

* [Maimonides is referring to an ancient controversy (see Mishnah *Meg.* iv, 10 (Eng. trs. *R.* p. 135). But the *Tosefta*, iv, 31 (*Z.* p. 228, line 6) says definitely that the Creation story may be read in public, as part of the Lectionary, and it may be translated to the people.]

He also explained several biblical incidents as having occurred not actually but in a vision, e.g. Jacob wrestling with the Angel, and Balaam's ass which talked.¹⁷

Turning now to the Christian theologians, I find that St Thomas makes certain obvious limitations to the theory of plenary inspiration: (1) the limitations of human language, especially at a remote period; (2) those imposed by the primitive mentality of the writer's contemporaries; and (3) the fact that figurative or allegorical language lends itself to misinterpretation by hasty or ignorant readers. But he insists that, wherever the *literal* sense conveys a *statement of fact*, that fact must not be questioned. For instance,

Those things which are said of [the earthly] Paradise in Scripture are put before us by the method of historical narration. But, in all things which Scripture thus hands down, we must hold to the truth of the story as our foundation, and fabricate our spiritual expositions upon that foundation.

Thus [he continues] although the Tree of Life is also a spiritual idea (Prov. iii, 18), yet there is also an actual Tree of Life growing up to the present day in the earthly Paradise—which Aquinas, of course, located as Dante does.¹⁸

Again, in another section of the *Summa*, St Thomas gives a most significant example of his view of what might be the literal statement of a passage. Commenting on Exod. xxxiii, 11, "And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face, as a man is wont to speak to his friend", St Thomas says: "When Scripture states that He spoke to him, this is to be understood as expressing

the opinion of the people who thought that Moses was speaking with God, mouth to mouth."

But despite the implicit liberalism of this explanation, St Thomas is still a firm supporter of the traditional view that

Just as everything was written for our learning, so everything in Holy Scripture has also come into being under the influence of inspiration, which was given precisely for the sake of teaching us.

The opposite opinion to this, whenever found, obviously stands as an exception. According to Talmudic Judaism, the words "Ham's sons are Cush and Mizraim", were as definitely dictated by God as were the words: "I am the Lord thy God...." According to St Thomas, the first interpretation of Holy Writ must be "the historical or literal", in which one may, indeed, have different significations according to different contexts. But "the literal sense is that which the Author intends, and the Author of Holy Writ is God". "There can be no falsehood anywhere in the literal sense of Holy Scripture." Consequently, even the smallest assertions of fact are inerrant; for instance, to deny that Elkanah was Samuel's father would be contrary to the Catholic Faith, "for it follows that the Divine Scriptures would be false".¹⁹

A couple of generations later, William of Ockham dealt with the same point. He had many reasons for differing from St Thomas, not only as being a Franciscan (to whom Dominicans were at that time often rivals and almost enemies), but also because he did not share the standpoint of Aquinas on many important questions. Yet on this point of biblical inspiration he is, if anything,

still more emphatic. He recurs to it over and over again in his *Dialogus*. The Pope himself may not contradict any biblical detail; it would be heresy in a Pope "if, for instance, he were to preach that David was not the son of Jesse, or that Jeroboam had not been King of Israel". In other places he gives similar concrete instances; it would be heretical to deny that Solomon was Bathsheba's son.

However, a new note had already been struck by a Jewish writer, Abraham ibn Ezra (died 1167) who may be called the first biblical critic. To quote A. T. Chapman,²⁰

Commenting on the words "The Canaanite was then in the land" (Gen. xii, 6, xiii, 7) he observes: "It appears that Canaan had already taken the land of Canaan from others." Apparently he is not satisfied with this explanation, for he adds, "but if it is not so, I have a secret, but the prudent man will keep silent". His meaning is obvious. The words "The Canaanite was then in the land" are those of a writer who lived when the Canaanite was no longer in the land. From Josh. xvi, 10, Judg. i, 27-33, II Sam. xxiv, 7, I Kings ix, 16, it appears that the Canaanites remained in parts of the land till the time of Solomon. Ibn Ezra suggests that this comment must be assigned to a period later than that of Solomon. But he knows how dangerous it is to incur the suspicion of heterodoxy, and contents himself with putting forth a riddle, the solution of which he leaves to the reader. His caution was justified; for the above remark and a few others expressed in the same cryptic style drew from one of his Jewish brethren the remark, "may melted gold be poured into his mouth". As with the Synagogue so with the Church: to impugn tradition was perilous in both, for the time of free speech was not yet.

B. SOCIAL LIFE

By A. C. ADCOCK

Having already considered certain Jewish ethical ideals, let us turn now to an illuminating example of their social application, the practice of charity.

The Jew always believed that poverty had its rights as well as its disabilities, and that beggars need not parade their woes in order to merit sympathy.* The mendicant exhibitionism which is usually so common in the East was entirely repulsive to Jewish susceptibilities.† As all ostentatious almsgiving is derogatory to the dignity of the recipient, it is better to "give no alms at all than to give them in public".‡ "Blessed is the man who considereth the poor" (Ps. xli) and lays the emphasis on the considerateness. The aim of charity

* [If a man possesses 50 *zuz* [a *zuz* is roughly a shilling] and can trade with this sum, he should not take [advantage of charitable relief by gleaning or by accepting the forgotten sheaf, the corner of the field left for the poor, or the poor-tithe]. If one who does not stand in need, takes such advantage, then, before he dies, he will stand in need. But, conversely, if one in need nevertheless refrains, then, ere he dies in old age, he will have supported others from his own property, of such a man it says 'Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord and whose hope the Lord is' (Jer. xvii, 7).]

"If a man is not lame or dumb or blind or halt yet so feigns himself, he will not die in old age till he becomes so, for 'he that searcheth after mischief, it shall come to him' (Prov. xi, 27)" (*Peah*, viii, 9 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 20)).]

† The same may be said of Islam: see the stories of a charitable Israelite and a Friend in Need in the *Arabian Nights*, trs. E. W. Lane, London, 1906, vol. II, pp. 376-7 and 379-80.

‡ [R. Yannai saw someone give a poor man a coin in public. He said, "Better thou hadst not given it him now, for thou hast shamed him" (*T.B. Hag.* 5a (Eng. trs. *Str.* p. 20)). See above, p. 46 for the "Chamber of the Secret Ones".]

is to make the poor self-supporting; and the beggars who parade their miseries in order to secure alms from passers-by would be regarded with no little contempt. This accounts for the rareness of street-begging among the Jews, and Lancelot Addison's belief that "the Jews have no beggars".

Maimonides therefore classifies the givers of charity in this manner: (1) He who helps the poor to sustain himself by giving a loan or taking him into business with him; (2) He who gives to the poor without knowing to whom he gives, while the recipient also is ignorant of the giver; (3) He who gives secretly, knowing the recipient, but the latter remaining ignorant as to his benefactor's name; (4) He who gives, not knowing the recipient, but the recipient knows from whom he receiveth the relief; (5) He who gives (both knowing) before he is asked; (6) He who gives after he is asked; (7) He who gives inadequately, but with a good grace; (8) He who gives with a bad grace.*²¹ In the ethical testament of Eleazar ben Isaac of Worms, who lived in the middle of the eleventh century, the following reference to charity occurs: "My son! shew honour

* [A somewhat similar classification is that of a homily in *Pes.R.* xi, f. 42 b (from Friedmann's notes). *Perekh*=K'far Perekho, in Samaria; *Jos. Vit.* 37, § 188, Löw, 87: famous for walnuts. R. Me'ir said: There are three sorts of nuts, the *Perekh* sort; the middling sort; the hard sort. The first bursts of its own accord. The second sort will open if you knock them. The third are difficult to break. If you hit hard with a stone and succeed in breaking it, you get no good out of it. So, among the Jews, you have people who give charity unasked: these are the best nuts. Others will give when asked: these are the middling nuts. Others, again, even if you press and beat them ever so often, you get no good out of them—these are the hard nuts to crack: of them the proverb says, "The door that opens not to charity opens to the doctor."]

to the poor and draw out thy soul unto him (Isa. LVIII, 10). Be punctilious to offer thy gift in secret, not in the public gaze. Give him food and drink in thy house but do not watch him while he eats. His soul famishes and perchance he swoops upon the viands" (Job IX, 26: cf. Maimonides, *Hilkhoth Berakhoth* 7, 6).*

But though house-to-house begging† is not approved by these writers, it was certainly practised in the Middle Ages. This was probably because the Jews were confined to their own quarters and tended to regard themselves as one large family; they did not solicit alms from Gentiles in this manner. Anyhow, the mediaeval conditions were very different from those envisaged in the Talmud, and there were many differences in practice between the two periods. Whereas relief in kind was a regular feature in the Talmudic period, it was less common in the Middle Ages. It was replaced by general hospitality, charitable

* This extract is from *H.E.W.* I, 41. Ele'azar's will is the earliest specimen of this type of literature. It was originally ascribed to Eliezer (or Eleazar) b. Hyrcanus, who died in the second century A.D.: on this see *H.E.W.* I, 31 sqq.

† [The phrase is *החויר על הפתחים*, lit. "to go round about [internal *hif'il*] the doors", a not uncommon expression, e.g. *T.B. Keth.* 108b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 817; Engl. trs. *D.* p. 262). Used of the Torah "begging for students" in *T.B. Sotah* 47b (Germ. trs. *G.* v, 347). Cp. also such frequent expressions as *געני בפתח*, e.g.

I come to supplicate Thee with my heart in tempest;
A beggar at Thy gates, I tender Thee my word
For pity: wake Thy kindness, grant not only justice,
And open Thou my lips, O Lord.

(The above is Mrs Salaman's rendering of the first verse of the Introductory hymn, in which the Leader in prayer seeks help on beginning the morning '*Amidah* on the second day of New Year. The prayer was composed in the tenth century by Simeon b. Isaac b. Abun, see p. 190 of the New Year volume in *P.B.D.A.*.)

inns and hostellries, and special benevolent societies.* In the Roman community, for example, there was a whole network of societies for all conceivable sorts of charitable purposes; and as these were loosely connected with the Synagogue, and also indulged in a large number of social functions, they were very similar in some respects to the mediaeval gilds.

The emphasis on charitable inns and the ransoming of slaves and captives reflects the newer social situation, in which many of the Jews were wandering pariahs, rendered destitute by the advance of the Crusaders, or practising trades which allowed them no fixed home. The "commercial traveller" who had wandered a long way and failed in his business was a too common figure among the mediaeval Jews.† Nor are such people always as considerate in receiving charity as their benefactors are in giving it; and the belief that charity is a religious duty which it is the right of the poor to expect has made the "schnorrer" an unusually troublesome figure in Jewish society.

* See above, p. 45.

† These travellers were not illiterate, witness the cheap books in Hebrew, Yiddish and Ladino, specially printed in small format for them. These once cheap books are now excessively rare. They are by no means limited to liturgies and devotional works. Soon after the invention of printing, the masterpieces of contemporary and ancient literature were to be found in the pack of the Jewish "bagman", the *Romance of the Rose*, *Paris and Venus*, the Arthur legends, etc. Of *Paris and Venus* only one copy has survived: it is in the Aldis Wright Collection at Trinity.

Thus these Jewish wanderers were intermediaries of thought no less than of commodities, just as in the fifth century before the Christian era, a Buddhist *Jataka* made its first appearance in the West in the form of the Aramaic *Ahikar* story preserved in the Elephantine papyri (see A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri* . . . , Oxford, 1923, p. 204).

A similar regard for the poor is seen in the Jewish attitude towards gleaning. The technicalities of the law on this point appear to have been made with equal regard for the convenience of the poor and the legal rights of the owner. For sometimes the distribution was done by the landowner; sometimes, the poor helped themselves,²² so that the landlord did not favour needy kinsmen—whom he would have had to support in any case—and the poor did not take more than their share or trample the landowner's crops. When we consider other cases, e.g. the laws of purchaser and seller, of the payment of retainers, of inheritance, of duties and imposts and corvées, etc. we find many interesting comparisons and contrasts between Mishnaic Palestine and Feudal Europe. When we turn to Talmudic and Gaonic Babylonia²³ we find how these Mishnaic ordinances were developed and applied, for the Jews lived in large groups with considerable autonomy, and thus we have an example of a social community organized on lines almost diametrically opposed to feudalism.

The whole attitude of the mediaeval Jew was largely dictated by the fact that he was, strictly speaking, outside the feudal system. He could not take the oath of fealty on the faith of a Christian; nor, for similar reasons, could he be admitted to the gilds. Feudalism was also built up on a military and agricultural basis: but the Jew was forbidden, as by the *Assize of Arms*, to possess weapons of any sort; and it was difficult for him to become absorbed into the agricultural system of an already well-populated and organized country, even apart from the religious question. This meant that the Jews were forced into occupations in which

there was little competition, or in which the religious vetos were not operative.

Banking and currency were the obvious opportunities. A system of credit was becoming more and more necessary by the twelfth century; and not only would a cosmopolitan race be unusually well fitted for arranging international credit and exchange, but also there were very definite canonical injunctions against interest which would form a necessary part of such a system. So the Jews, who were not bound by the Canon Law of the Roman Church, became the principal money-lenders and bankers.

This kind of work was also the safest for the Jews as pariahs, subject to expulsion and exile. For their possessions could be easily liquidated, and were very mobile. And as in the Dark Ages the "Syrian Traders" had already had considerable practice in this occupation, the mediaeval Jew was able "to provide mediaeval society with the capital which it considered disgraceful to provide, but with which it found itself unable to dispense".*

This choice of occupation, however clearly it may have been forced on the Jews by social circumstances, has led to the belief that the Jewish views on the ethics of usury are very different from those of Christianity. In a sense they certainly are: there is no absolute condemnation of interest in Jewish ethics similar to that of mediaeval Canon Law. The Jewish attitude to the matter has always been pragmatic: the Catholic attitude was definitely *a priori*. But it is not true baldly

* Cecil Roth, in *Camb. Med. Hist.* vii, 645. J. Jacobs notes that Aaron of Lincoln financed no less than nine Cistercian Abbeys, as well as St Albans. *J.A.E.* p. xiv.

to assert that the Jews objected to taking usury from each other, but had no conscience as regards mulcting the Gentile. As Mr Loewe points out in a Supplementary Note to his collection of Starrs and Charters, the alien (*Ger*) living in the land must be treated with as much consideration as if he were a Jew; and as Jewish ethics were intended to apply to a stable agricultural community, extensive practising of the credit system was undesirable on purely economic grounds. But there were also the aliens (*Nokhri*), who were just visiting the land for trading purposes, who never intended to fit into the local social system, and who were very problematic business partners, since it was difficult to make them pay their debts. Hence there was no objection to the Jews receiving compensation for loans which were contracted in such circumstances, and which entailed considerable risk. Such foreign contracts necessitated the use of interest, since the only alternative would be the imposition of the local traditions on the foreigner, an obviously unfair expedient.²⁴ Even so, Jewish moralists had sufficient conscientious scruples towards the foreigner to condemn usury which was out of all proportion to the risks involved. Their position was based on an objective study of moral and economic duty, with regard to all the factual circumstances, and unhampered by any superstitious appeal to theological sanctions. This attitude is very different from that of the mediaeval Church which based its whole doctrine of usury on a mistranslation of Luke vi, 35.²⁵ And, if we may draw any conclusions from the numerous technical evasions of Canon Law, it would appear that there was considerable tension between theological dogma and economic necessity in the Middle Ages.²⁶

To regard the Jews as unduly extortionate, ignores the fact that people like those described by the anti-Semite would be bitter competitors among themselves, and would unscrupulously undercut each other. It also ignores the fact that Christians did lend money on usury, and that preference for Jewish lenders would seem to imply that their terms were better than those of the Christians. As we shall see later, "ridding the debtor of the Jew" was not always dictated by philanthropy; transference of debt might be very profitable to the party to whom it was transferred.

The Church frequently profited considerably by this procedure. A debt owed to a Jew might be secured on the debtor's lands. If payment became too onerous, the debtor might choose to give his lands to the Church as a free gift, provided that the Church would undertake the responsibility of paying the debt. In other words, the Church took over the land at the cost of the burden of the mortgage. As this represented a very small fraction of the real value of the land, the gain to the Church was considerable; and this sort of "philanthropy" was remarkably good ecclesiastical policy.

As we are here dealing with mortgages, it is worthy of note that the English law on the point is derived from the State's dealing with the Jews. There were two sorts of security on land: *vivum vadum* in which the creditor took possession of the land and paid himself out of the produce; and *mortuum vadum* in which the creditor took possession, but did not pay off the debt by the produce. If, however, a Jew needed security, neither of these methods was suitable; for Jews could not legally own land. A special procedure, the

Jewish gage, was needed. Land was pledged in security,

The debtor remained in possession of the land. But should the debtor make default in payment of the interest or in repayment of the principal, the Jewish creditor might seize the land. He could hold it for a year and a day, and then sell it, or he might keep it till the rents and profits paid off the debt, and the arrears of interest. It was called *mortuum* by analogy with *mortuum vadium* (though the true analogy would seem to be with *vivum vadium*) and the whole institution was called the Jewish gage. This was, therefore, a mortgage in name, and it was certainly a mortgage in fact.... It is a noteworthy fact that the Jews called the transaction *mashkon meth*, "dead gage", a literal translation of *mortgage*.²⁷

As the Jews enjoyed so anomalous a position in feudal society, they were taken in hand by the King who gave them reasonable protection and made considerable use of them. While the Jews were in England, 1066–1290, they financed the King against the Barons in the various feudal risings, just as they had previously assisted the Normans to overcome the Anglo-Saxons. They were also protected by the Kings having their debts assigned to him, and the Crown profited by this procedure almost as much as the Church did.

But, though the King had to have his Jews, it was frequently in his interest to have a few of them converted. For as it is unseemly that a Christian should live on wealth previously amassed in a state of sin, so it was expedient that converted Jews should surrender their possessions to the King. This accounts for the Royal interest in Jewish missions. The practice also shows the mediaeval Church in a very good light. The Papacy frequently advocated mercy, and thought it

unchristian to take away the possessions of converts. It was also obvious that financial considerations would considerably hinder the progress of missions. Alexander III and Gregory VII were consistently opposed to the practice. Not only was it questionable from a religious point of view, it also tended to make emperors and kings too wealthy.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER VI

¹ *J.I.C.* pp. 141-2.

² H. C. Lea, *A History of the Inquisition*, I, 67-8.

³ See issues for Feb. 10, 11, 24-5, 27-8, Mar. 2-6, 9, 16, 1936.

⁴ *Yad, Deot* II, 3. For similar examples see I. Abrahams, *Ethical Wills*, Philadelphia, 1927, II, 211 and 230. Also M. Joseph, *Judaism as Creed and Life*, London, 1909, p. 330.

⁵ *S.R.P.* p. 17.

⁶ *Cod. Hier.* cap. 9.

⁷ *Summa*, 2a, 2, *Quae.* II, art. 7.

⁸ Rulman Merswin, *Buch v. d. Neun Felsen*, ed. C. Schmidt, Leipzig, 1859, p. 54.

⁹ *Iggeret Teman, Responsa*, II, 2a.

¹⁰ *Responsa* I, 14b.

¹¹ A. Cohen, *The Teachings of Maimonides*, London, 1927, p. 116.

¹² *Responsa* II, 23d sqq.

¹³ *S.R.P.* p. 86.

¹⁴ *Judah Hallevi's Kitab al Khazari* . . . , trs. H. Hirschfeld, Part IV, 22; ed. I, London, 1905, p. 225; ed. II, London, 1931, p. 199.

¹⁵ *Iggeret Teman, Responsa*, II, 4b.

¹⁶ *Guide*, II, 29.

¹⁷ Cohen, *Teaching of Maimonides*, pp. 163-4.

¹⁸ *Summa Theologiae*, 1a, Q. cii, art. i.

¹⁹ *Summa Theologiae*, 1a, Q. xxxii, art. iv.

²⁰ *Introduction to the Pentateuch*, Cambridge, 1911, p. 26.

²¹ *J.L.* pp. 313 sqq.

²² *Peah* IV (Eng. trs. D. p. 13).

²³ See *A.L.*

²⁴ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. cl.

²⁵ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. cii.

²⁶ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. cv.

²⁷ F. A. Lincoln, in *S.C.B.M.* II, p. LXIV.

CHAPTER VII
RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION
BY
A. C. ADCOCK

CHAPTER VII

RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

The Age of the Renaissance and Reformation was for the Jew the Age of the Inquisition and the Ghetto. Expelled in theory from the greater part of Western Europe as social parasites, blasphemers and magicians, the Jews as a racial group were usually confined to the Ghetto; yet a few distinguished individuals* did very much to further the culture which Christian scholars regarded as valuable, and the biblical criticism which gave the Reformation its intellectual foundation. In no previous century, perhaps, had the Jewish influence been so far-reaching; never before had it produced such obvious effects on the history of European civilization.

The Reformation which finally disintegrated the mediaeval synthesis was mainly a reaction from philo-

* An interesting example of the influence of distinguished Jews in an earlier period is that of Gabirol, known to mediaeval Christians as Avicebron, and never suspected of having been a Jew. "The Scholastics who fought about his philosophy had no idea that he was a Jew and renowned as a writer of religious hymns used in the Synagogue. The reason is inherent in the work itself....Gabirol nowhere betrays his Judaism in the *Fons Vitae*. He never quotes a biblical verse or a Talmudic dictum....The treatise is purely speculative. And so, for centuries, Gabirol marched through the philosophic schools of Mediaeval Europe, some taking him for a Christian and some for a Mohammedan, none suspecting that he was a Jew. It was on November 12, 1846, that the learned world was startled by the announcement of Solomon Munk in the *Literaturblatt des Orients* that the well-known Scholastic Avicebron was identical with the still better-known Solomon ibn Gabirol" (S.R.P. p. xxxii). For Maimonides and others, see above, pp. 233 sqq.

sophy to history. Christianity had always been in one sense the religion of a book: but the Reformation changed the status of that book. Instead of remaining a storehouse of Schoolmen's premisses, it then became a historical tradition to be lived into; and the speculations of the infidel Jew were regarded as intrinsically interesting. The Renaissance Christ lived in a Jewish environment and believed Jewish ideas; He may even have been a Kabbalist, and His teaching was probably more akin to the Secret Tradition of Israel than to the ratiocinations of the Schoolmen. Pico della Mirandola was convinced that "No science yields greater proof of the Divinity of Christ than magic and the Kabbalah"; and Reuchlin used similar methods to deduce the doctrine of the Trinity from the first verse of Genesis.¹ Pope Sixtus IV was so fascinated by this new orientation of Christian theology that he tried to get the Kabbalistic writings translated into Latin as a textbook for young divinity students; and at the same time, in northern Europe, heretics were assimilating Jewish esoteric ideas to the already subversive mysticism of the Netherlands. But whereas in Italy the speculations of the Christian Kabbalists were sterilized by writers like Leo Judah, and took their place as one element in the elegant sentimentalism and dilettantism of the day,* they were

* *Vide A. E. Waite, The Holy Kabbalah, p. 429, London, 1929.* Referring to *The Mysteries of Love*, he writes: "We look in vain for the essential doctrines of Jewish theosophy, as these are enshrined in the Zohar. We have in their place the elegant sentimentalism which characterized Italian literature at that period. There is not one trace of characteristic Hebrew thought. There is nothing which would make us even suspect a Jewish authorship except such negative evidence as the absence of any Christian reference. If the work can be said to recall anything outside the *belles lettres*

loosely associated in Germany with some of the crudest and most fanatical sects which emerged from the chaos of the Reformation. In more respectable and philosophical circles there was also a genuine and direct influence of real Judaism on Christian thought, an influence which was deprecated by all the ecclesiastical authorities alike. "It has not been generally recognized that when Calvin burned Michael Servetus at Geneva in 1553, he was trying to burn away the influence exercised by Marrano Judaism on the dogmas of Christianity."² But though Servetus died, his ideas lived on in many types of immanent theology, and prepared the way for Spinoza; while his interpretation of Isa. lIII has had a very illustrious history within the Christian churches, and takes its place in the Antiochene or Adoptianist tradition in Christology.

We shall consider in this essay, therefore, (1) the social status of the Jews in the sixteenth century, and their influence on Christian economic and political ideas; (2) the Christian debt to the Jews as biblical critics and teachers of Hebrew; (3) the general influence of Jewish biblical theology on the Reformation; and (4) the cultural importance of the "Secret Tradition" of Israel as expressed in the Kabbalah and the Zohar.

(1) The social relations between Jews and Christians in the early Middle Ages were not usually unfriendly. The Ghetto was an institution of the future and the Jews fitted into society under more or less normal conditions, despite the efforts of the Church to segregate of the sixteenth century in Italy, it is certain Sufic poets adapted to the understanding of Venetian ladies in the days of the Doges."

It is essential to realize that much sixteenth-century Kabbalism was no more than a literary fashion with little or no religious or philosophical influence.

them. They were on friendly terms with a large number of Christian traders and played a normal part in civic life. As Dr Abrahams points out, the anti-semitic calumnies which we are apt to regard as normal mediaeval beliefs were usually the creations of fanatical or biased leaders rather than the results of everyday experience. Anti-semitic myths can usually be traced to fanatical instigators who created an ill-feeling which did not otherwise exist.... Usury doubtless helped to make the Jews unpopular, but here again the masses were less affected than the classes, as it was usually from the nobility and aristocracy that the Jews drew their most frequent clients.... The masses never charged the Jews with the fault most common in attacks on them, viz. lack of social interest.... It was the theologians who proclaimed the Jews antisocial and the haters of their kind. This supposed enmity of the Jews to the human race was dinned into the ears of the masses until the calumny became part of the popular creed.³

But since the beginning of the Crusades the position of the Jews had become more and more dangerous. Not only were they greatly affected by the destruction of the Languedoc civilization; the Church waged war on them as a group of infidels in all the countries of Europe. They were expelled from England in 1290; and the French kings vacillated in their policy, reconciling economic expediency with a Catholic conscience by a combination of intermittent protection and perpetual extortion. The Spanish Jews, who formed the largest and most prosperous community in Europe, were comparatively safe; but they were soon imperilled by the religious and political centralization pursued by Ferdinand and Isabella. When in 1492 they were officially expelled, they were ruined economically and

left stranded with no permanent home in the midst of a hostile Europe. But this expulsion, though involving terrible hardships to the Jews themselves, was of great importance in the history of European civilization. Not only did it lead directly to the complete ruin of Spain in the later sixteenth century; it also scattered the most advanced Jews of the day, and diffused their culture very widely, mainly from their centres in Holland, Poland and Italy.

The expulsion from Spain was mainly the activity of the centralizing State authorities and of the National Inquisition which served their purposes. Many of the Cortes in the more democratic and commercial states strongly objected to the policy on economic and social grounds; and as the heterogeneous nature of Spanish society made the activities of the Inquisition very dangerous to almost everyone—for who could feel safe when even the omission of the *Gloria* from a chanted psalm was adequate proof of Crypto-Judaism?—the persecution of Marrano and Jew was never based on popular sentiment.

In Germany, where there were many cases of mob atrocities, the case was different. The fanatical popular hatred of Jews was one feature of the general hysteria which is noted by all Reformation historians. It may have been due to neuroses following on plague, or to economic hardship in the more backward parts, and it has been explained in the latter way by the Communist historian Kautsky. It may have been furthered by a general fear of anarchy and invasion in a country where feudalism was disintegrating in a peculiarly unpleasant manner; or we may blame the Mendicant Friars and their teachings for the mass production of

hysterical religiosity. But, however we may choose to explain it, the symptoms are quite clear: the formation of a large number of secret religious societies and esoteric cults; a pathological fear of the Turk and of the subterfuges of the heathen in general. Anyone who studies the early life of Luther will readily appreciate what is meant by describing German religion at that time as pathological. Grisar may be overstating the case when he gives an almost completely Freudian interpretation of Luther's spiritual history; but the amazingly obscene sexual calumnies on the Jews in which he and his followers indulged certainly indicate an unusually perverted state of mind. For sheer unadulterated filthiness, Luther's anti-semitism attained a very high degree of excellence which it would be difficult to surpass, and most of his statements are almost unprintable.* But by the irony of history, the Jews were ultimately to profit by the fanaticism which aimed at crushing them. The Wars of Religion culminated in the Thirty Years' War, the destructive effects of which are usually understated, and gave German civilization a setback from which it took nearly two centuries to recover. It was the Jewish quarters which suffered least, owing to the importance of the Jews to Catholic and Protestant princes alike. It was therefore left to the German Jews, the neutrals, to play a prominent part in German culture from that day to this.

Nor was the popular coupling of Jew and Turk quite so far-fetched as one might think. For when the highly civilized and industrialized Spanish Jews were expelled from Christian lands, their safest sanctuary was the

* The least restrained passages are quoted at length in Grisar, *Life of Luther*, vols. v and vi, London, 1917.

Empire of Solymen the Magnificent. The Turks, who have always been skilled in conquest though not in organization or government, cordially welcomed a body of trained industrialists into a land where practical and social activity counted for more than religious orthodoxy. Isaac Zarphati, who fled to Turkey, wrote to his German brethren an open letter in which he contrasted the Crescent and the Cross in these terms:

I have been informed of the calumnies, more bitter than death, which have befallen our brethren in Germany; of the tyrannical laws, the compulsory baptisms, and the banishments which daily take place. And if they flee from one place, greater misfortunes befall them in another. I hear an impudent nation raising up its impudent voice against the faithful, and see its hand swinging over them. There are woes within and woes without; daily edicts and taskmasters to extort money. The spiritual guides and the monks, the false priests, rise up against the unhappy people, and say, "We shall persecute them to destruction, the name of Israel shall no longer be remembered." They imagine that their religion is in danger because the Jews in Jerusalem, peradventure, purchase the Church of the Sepulchre. For this reason, they have issued a decree that every Jew who is found on a Christian ship sailing for the East is to be cast into the sea. How are the holy German communities treated! How are their energies weakened! The Christians not only drive them from place to place, but lurk after their lives, brandish over them the sharpened sword, cast them into the flaming fire, into surging waters, or into stinking swamps. My brethren and teachers, friends and acquaintances, I, Isaac Zarphati, who came from France, was born in Germany, and there sat at the feet of masters, proclaim to you that Turkey is a land in which nothing is wanted. "If you are willing, it shall be well with you." You shall go safely from Turkey to the Holy Land.

Is it not better to live among Mohammedans than among Christians? Here we are allowed to dress in the finest material, here everyone sits under his own figtrees and vines; while in Christian countries, you are not permitted even to dress your children in red or blue without exposing them to be beaten red or blue. Hence you are obliged to walk about like beggars and in rags! All your days are gloomy, even your Sabbaths and festivals; strangers enjoy your possessions, and what use are treasures to a wealthy Jew? He keeps them only to his misfortune, and they are all lost in a day.⁴

The Holy Roman Empire and the Spanish Kingdom which expelled the Jews succeeded, therefore, only in financing and organizing their bitterest enemy. What internal stability the Turkish Empire had in the sixteenth century, it owed almost entirely to the Jews.

None of the other places to which the Jews fled were more than half-way houses. There appeared a reasonable chance of security in Portugal at first; and many of the Jews did succeed in playing an important part in Portuguese colonial expansion: such names as Joseph of Lamego, Abraham of Beja, Vecinho, Zacuto, Gaspar da Gama are obvious examples of this.⁵ But there were naturally far more of the unfortunate who fled from Spain only to become chattels in the Portuguese slave trade; and the generosity of the wealthy Jews who ransomed their less fortunate kinsmen is one of the best and noblest examples of Jewish philanthropy and group-loyalty in a gloomy century of hardship.

The Papacy disapproved of many of Torquemada's activities and was often prepared to welcome in the Papal States the Jews it had already tried to protect in Spain. Italian culture was fairly cosmopolitan and there was no very strong bias against the Jews there.

Hence the very considerable Jewish activity in the printing industry, and the prevalence of Jewish teachers of Hebrew. Venice also had a Jewish suburb, and based its naval and commercial supremacy on Jewish capital. But not only were many districts much less liberal; the Jews enjoyed very varying fortunes in the Papal States themselves, owing to the frequent changes of Papal policy. Clement VII was their only consistent and painstaking supporter in the Papal States; and Venice in its decline was a very insecure abode, the accredited enemy of all the other City States. And despite the good intentions of the rulers, the very considerable influx of Jews into Italy after the Spanish expulsion, together with the general and natural rivalry of the Christian traders, led to their segregation in Rome and Venice, and to all the overcrowding and inevitable hardships of the Ghetto.

What little security the Jews did enjoy in Italy was soon to be ended by the Spanish domination which transferred Spanish bigotry to yet another land. The liberalism of the Renaissance Papacy was ended by Spanish arms; and when this was also assisted by the propaganda of the Jesuits we come to the age of the Roman Index.⁶ Whatever the intentions of its originators may have been, edicts for the destruction of all books published by any firm which had ever been convicted of publishing heretical works meant wholesale vandalism in the sphere of literature; this involved the complete ruin of the Jewish printers and the promiscuous destruction of all Hebrew writings, including even the Holy Scriptures. And after the Papacy of Caraffa, general Jew-baiting was prosecuted in earnest.⁷

Dudley Wright has a whole chapter on the burnings of the Talmud alone. In June, 1242, twenty-four cart-loads were burnt in Paris.⁸ Nevertheless, Hebrew books survived. Sometimes they were buried and hidden. For example, Rabbi Abraham Saba, a Portuguese exile of 1497, surrendered his books in obedience to the royal decree. He says in a letter⁹

But I took my life in my hands by carrying with me to Lisbon the "Commentary on the Law" which I had composed, as well as a commentary to the treatise "Ethics of the Fathers" and one to the "Five Scrolls"....

But when I reached Lisbon all the Jews came to me and told me that it had been proclaimed to the community that every Jew who might be found with a book or with phylacteries in his possession would be put to death. So straightway, before I entered the quarter outside the city, I took these books in my hand; two brothers went with me, and dug a grave among the roots of a blossoming olive tree; there we buried them. Yet, although a tree flourishing with lovely fruit stood there, because of the Law which was within it, did I call it "Tree of Sorrow"; for I have buried there all that was pleasant in my sight—the commentary on the Laws and the Commandments, more precious than gold, yea, than much fine gold. For in them I had found consolation for the loss of my two little ones, torn from me by force to become unwilling converts. And I had said, "These books are the inheritance of those who worship God; therefore must they be better for me than even sons and daughters."

Sometimes books survived by chance, or in fragments, witness the single leaf of the Hebrew penitential liturgy, preserved at Pembroke College, Cambridge, from the Bury St Edmunds library, or the fragment, also a single leaf, of perhaps the oldest medical MS. in the University

(now at Queens'). Both these relics were preserved in the bindings of books. Sometimes Christians rescued books from the holocaust and resold them to their Jewish owners. Thus, at Venice, in 1550, Rabbi Judah Lerma, a Spaniard, writes:

And among them they burnt all the copies of my own works, which I had had printed, and which amounted to 1500 volumes; I lost every book which I had in Venice, and nothing printed or written was left to me—not even a single page for a remembrance. So I was forced to begin to write my work all over again from memory; but then, after I had written three chapters of it, I found a single copy of the edition in the possession of some Christians, who had snatched it from the fire; and this I secured at a great cost.¹⁰

But destruction cannot destroy the written word. It, conversely, stimulated the Jews. They redoubled their activity and recopied and reprinted all that they could save.

The only Christian lands where the Jews enjoyed any reasonable degree of safety were Poland and the United Provinces. In the land famous for John Hus and much anti-sacerdotal Judaizing, the Jews as a group were very welcome, and the Jewish Schools in Poland and Hungary were famous for many decades as the most enlightened in Europe. M. Güdemann, citing from an unpublished manuscript of Maharl (Vienna Codex, 175), states that the Prague Hussites, in their public processions, sang Psalms and hymns in Hebrew and German composed by R. Avigdor Kara.¹¹ But it was in Holland that the Jews fared best. In a land which lived on trade, the Jewish and Christian enemies of Philip II united to destroy him, and Dutch independence eventually gave the Jews one safe home

in Europe. Their society was elaborately and freely organized in a land of religious toleration. Holland then became the centre of Jewish capitalism in Europe; and it was the Synagogue at Amsterdam which did most to transmit the fruits of Jewish philosophy to the West, and which produced the greatest of all Jewish philosophers, Benedict Spinoza. It was also Holland which, thanks to its Rabbinical Scholars, gave Calvinism a complete and elaborate Biblical Theology; and where the great intellectual battles of Calvinist philosophy were fought out. The general Dutch attitude to the Jews was so unique that it came to the English Diarist, John Evelyn, as a most amazing revelation.*

We have frequently had occasion so far to couple Judaism and Capitalism. This raises an important point in the history of economic morals. As a result of the researches of Sombart, Weber, Troeltsch, Tawney, Robertson and Brodrick, we have learnt to regard the religious revolution of the sixteenth century as an important turning point in the history of social ethics. For the Protestant idea of the "Calling" is said to have sanctified industry in the sense of giving a powerful religious sanction to acquisition for its own sake, and making the profiteer sanctimonious and puritanical. The Protestant teaching and its results are summed up by Miss James as follows:

At home the doctrine of an active faith resulted in a sort of sanctified industrialism. Abroad, it produced sanctified imperialism. Just as individuals were supposed to glorify

* Cf. also Pepys' references to Jews, 19 Feb. 1665/6; 14 Oct. 1663. Pepys here mentions "insurance policies" taken out against the possibility of Sabbatai Zebi's being a true Messiah; he also mentions a visit to the Creechurch Lane Synagogue.

God by rising to a higher position than their fellows, so a chosen nation was said to exalt Him by dominating its neighbours. One writer declared that: "As a well-monied man that is prudent, by God's blessing gets up and above his Neighbours; so it would bee with a rich State, through God's being well-managed."¹²

The importance of this discussion for us lies in the assertion, frequently made, that this represents a reversion from the ethics of Catholicism to those of Judaism. The new idea, it is said, is a reflection of the non-ascetic ideas of the Old Testament, in which the main duty of the Children of Israel was to enter the land of Canaan, the land flowing with milk and honey, to reap all the good things the Lord had provided there; to be fruitful and multiply, and to live in prosperity—a tradition of which the extortionate Jewish capitalists were doubtless well aware. Jewish ethics were certainly not based on the Catholic distinction of two levels of perfection, the one for the Religious, the other for the Secular; and renunciation of this world and its goods were never called for. The Jews, who had already dominated European commerce in practice, now gave Christendom the moral principles of the acquisitive and God-fearing Puritan.

The Puritan ethic, however, is a very peculiar example of rationalization. The Lutheran and Calvinist moralists certainly did rebel against the idea of two standards on the ground that it savoured of sacerdotalism. They also succeeded in misunderstanding completely the Catholic teaching on that matter. In place of it Luther erected his doctrine of the "Calling", a term which was introduced into all the languages of Europe in the sixteenth century. He borrowed the

term from Ecclesiasticus xi, 20, 21, and was right, according to Weber, in assuming that of all the ancient languages, Hebrew alone* has any similar concept. He translated it into German as *bleibe in deinem Beruf* which was a more accurate and pregnant interpretation than any which was possible in a Greek translation. The equivalent in the Romance languages would be the Spanish *vocación* and the Italian *vocazione*. The word indicates a peculiar ethical attitude to one's appointed work in life, an attitude very different from the Catholic utilitarian advocacy of the value of economic labour. The history of the new word and the new idea in Protestant writings is worked out in detail by Max Weber, who shows its implications as suggesting a new and specifically religious valuation of secular labour.¹³ To give such an examination here would involve us in excessive technicality. It is necessary only to point out that the Protestant idea that a man is predestined to a particular economic task by Divine Decree and that his success therein is a good criterion of his spiritual condition, is very different from the attitude of Aquinas, for example. For though, in one sense, Aquinas regards the division of society into economic classes as ordained by God, the position of the individual in his particular *officium* is due to *causae naturales*, and a man who is unsuccessful in his economic activity may yet be a perfect Christian.¹⁴

To the Protestant moralist, however, the duty of every Christian was to succeed in the Calling or *Beruf* to which he was predestined; and economic success came to be regarded as a sign of favour in the sight of God. If the way of righteous acquisition were open

* *Hok*, in Exod. v, 14, referring to a statutory task. Also used in the phrase "Daily Bread" (Prov. xxx, 8).

to a man, he was shirking his predestined task if he were sufficiently other-worldly to renounce it. Provided he worked strictly in accordance with the letter of the Law and were not actually dishonest, he would be fulfilling his Calling. But wealth must not be regarded as a means to luxury: here entered a new sort of asceticism, and the believer is instructed to work hard and practise self-denial in order that he may rise in economic status. It is more important that he shall rise socially than that he shall be free from economic worries and able to spend his time in religious practices such as meditation and devotion.

Nor should any considerations of pity towards rivals beaten in the race for wealth allow the successful man to squander his goods in charity. For God's Decree is hard, and the beaten rival cannot have merited His favour. Certain duties must certainly be rendered him according to the strict interpretation of the Law; but God's Sovereign Decree should not be diverted by sentimental kindness, which would have the effect of giving the stewardship of God's wealth into the hands of the ungodly. The Puritan duties to the poor were viewed in a very legalistic spirit. Certain duties must be performed; but more credit is attached to duty for duty's sake, according to the letter of the Law, than for any number of kind acts resulting from mere kindness. Works of supererogation are of the nature of sin.*

This attitude is sometimes said to resemble that of the Old Testament and the Talmudic Rabbis: the criterion of good works is whether or not they are commanded in the Torah. Weber admits the super-

* On Puritan views concerning Poor Relief, *vide* F. R. Salter, *Some Early Tracts on Poor Relief*, London, 1926.

ficial similarity of Jewish and Protestant ethics in this respect; and he is certainly right in concluding that the similarity is only superficial. Puritan moralists extrapolated all the harder precepts in the Old Testament, and ignored all the more mystical and emotional passages. There is a very great gulf between the Book of Job and the doctrine that all economic hardship is a sign of Divine wrath. Nor is the rigid antithesis of wealth and poverty at all similar to the Jewish distinction between Jew and Gentile. It may be true that Judaism is not an ascetic religion in the Catholic sense; but it certainly did *not* preach the peculiar Puritan sort of asceticism. As for Jewish charity, we have already heard enough about its theory and practice to be able to contrast it with the Poor Law of the Puritans in a way which is hardly favourable to the latter.* So far was Puritan morality from the Jewish that it might more accurately be described as its negation.

Nor was there anything more than the most superficial resemblance between Jewish and Puritan capitalism. As Weber rightly remarks:

To the English Puritans, the Jews of their time were representatives of that type of capitalism which was involved in war, Government contracts, State monopolies, speculative promotions, and the construction of financial projects on behalf of princes, which they themselves condemned. In fact, the difference may, in general, with the necessary qualifications, be formulated: that Jewish capitalism was speculative pariah-capitalism, while the Puritan was bourgeois organization of labour.†

* On Jewish charity, see pp. 243 sqq.

† Weber, *op. cit.* p. 271. Weber also examines the relation of Talmudic and Protestant ethics, criticizing the views of Sombart, pp. 270-1.

On Protestant political theory, however, Jewish literature had far greater direct influence. Not only had Jews been deemed responsible for anti-sacerdotal and secularist theories of the State in the Middle Ages; but also there were no signs in the Old Testament, as read by Protestant divines, of the Catholic hierarchy of Church and State as two corporations exercising authority within one society. Church and State were one in Jewish thought: there was one "People" with a divine mission, and there was no clear division between its sacred and secular activities. It was the realisation of this that led the Reformers to give to the Godly Prince the powers they refused to the Pope; and Protestant theocracy was garnished with a multitude of biblical precedents.

But though Jewish literature was the source of the Protestant Godly Prince who must never be resisted, the Hebrew Prophets were taken as the model opponents of royal tyranny; and whereas Calvin pointed to all the ideal Jewish theocratic Princes, Servetus was more interested in Isaiah's righteous resistance to the *ungodly prince*. It was in the same spirit that the American exiles modelled their constitutions on supposed Hebrew lines.

We may also note, as a digression, one particularly interesting occasion on which the advice of a Jewish moralist was called for—the divorce of Henry VIII. In order to find some sort of ethical justification for the divorce of Catherine of Aragon, Henry summoned Rabbi Mark Raphael of Venice and asked for the opinion of the Rabbis as to the permissibility of Divorce according to the Torah. He also expressed decided distaste for the Roman Catholic interpretation

of the Bible on this matter. The opinion of Mark Raphael ran as follows:

That the Queen's marriage ought not to be disputed or dissolved, but, nevertheless, that the King may, and can very well take another wife conjointly with his first. Although the King's marriage with the widow of his brother was a true and legitimate act, yet he does not style himself properly husband of the Queen, inasmuch as, according to (Jewish) law, the posterity issuing from such a union is ascribed to the first husband; and as it would be unreasonable that, in order to preserve the name and race of the deceased, the survivor should be prevented from having posterity of his own, and bearing his name, the Law allows him to take another wife. (*H.J.E.* p. 104.)

This opinion did not satisfy the King; so the Rabbi had to revise it.

It is allowable for a man to take to wife the widow of his brother, provided he do it out of his own desire and will, and with the direct intention of procuring descent to his brother's line. Without such marked intention the marriage is forbidden by divine law. God said so by the mouth of Moses, and cast His malediction on all those who married without such an intention, for if they did so marry, no generation could spring forth from them, and, if any, it could not last long. (*ib.*)

This opinion was a little better, but there is no reason to suppose that Rabbinic opinion was very influential, or that Henry would not have acted as he did without the authority of the Torah.

(2) Turning now to the influence of Jewish scholarship on the development of Protestantism, we must lay very great emphasis on the Reformers' contention that they based their whole creed on the inspired texts of the Old and New Testaments, believing nothing as

required for salvation that is not contained therein nor can be proved thereby. As the Roman Catholic Church professed already to have extracted all the major theological doctrines to be found in the Scriptures; and as the Reformers did not accept Roman Catholic doctrine; only intense biblical study could show where the Church had erred.

The initial difficulty of this procedure lay in the fact that the Christian Scriptures were also Jewish Scriptures, many allusions of which would be intelligible only to scholars who were well versed in Hebrew language and folklore. This necessitated Jewish teachers. This again was hardly satisfactory, for the Old Testament was also the Canon of Jewish Theology which differed in many important respects from the Christian. But the need to rely on Jewish exegesis might easily lead to the acceptance of Jewish theology. Many of the prominent Christian Hebraists who had been trained by Jews were in fact accused of "judaizing".¹⁵ In some cases the accusation was just: in some respects traditional Christian thought was, as we shall see later, diverted into Jewish channels. But in most cases the charge had little foundation. Even Bishop Lightfoot himself was once condemned by an opponent as a "Rabbi"; and most of the Reformation scholars studied Hebrew only because they were good scholars. The accusation of "judaizing"** from which even the most sober biblical critics suffered was probably due to no small extent to the fashionable interest in Kabbalistic magic which was also based on Hebrew studies. Theological partisans are not always unduly

* For an interesting parallel, see Dr Parkes' remarks, above, p. 137.

discriminating in /their abuse, and respectable theologians were sometimes accused of dabbling in magic of which they knew little or nothing.

In the centuries prior to the Reformation only a few individuals other than Jews were well versed in Hebrew. But in the sixteenth century it was regarded as a vital and very interesting branch of study; and though the Reformers were first in the field, their Catholic opponents very soon copied their interest as a means of combating heresy. Some sects, such as the Verschorists and the Hutchinsonians even made a competent knowledge of Hebrew a requirement for full Church membership.

Most of the revisions and translations of the Canon in the sixteenth century owed much therefore to Hebrew studies and individual Jewish scholars. This was quite in accordance with the mediaeval custom; for as Soury points out,

Whenever anyone felt impelled to correct certain obscure passages of the Vulgate or other ancient Latin versions on the basis of the Hebrew text, he summoned erudite Jews and addressed to them questions concerning these passages. The Jews brought their Scrolls of the Law, and when questioned, translated the Hebrew text into the vernacular tongue.*¹⁸

There was, in fact, very considerable dissatisfaction with the Vulgate; and the Reformers owed much to the School of Roger Bacon, to say nothing of Nicholas

* Roger Bacon's Hebrew Grammar is particularly worthy of note as a very important English contribution to mediaeval Hebraism. *Vide S. A. Hirsch, Book of Essays*, pp. 2 sqq., "Early English Hebraists", London, 1905. Also H. P. Stokes in *Jewish Historical Society Transactions*, Presidential Address for 1909, in *Trans.* vol. vii, London 1915.

of Lyra and the Rabbinic exegetes from whom he extensively borrowed.* The real importance of the Reformation interest in Hebrew lay not so much in the fact that it was original, which it certainly was not, as in the fact that it was unusually sustained.†

The most striking manifesto in favour of Hebrew scholarship is to be found in Zwingli's preface to the *Explanation of Isaiah*, which is well worth quoting.

The ignorance of Hebrew forms of expression has led to an erroneous interpretation of many passages of Scripture, not only by those unlearned and reckless individuals, who pass sweeping judgments, with the more arrogance the greater their ignorance is, on all the subjects of antiquity, but even by truly pious and learned men themselves. Now certain figures of speech are so peculiar and native to the Hebrews that it is impossible to render them into any other language. Translators and commentators, however, have given us the Hebrew forms of expression without breaking down and reducing the figures they contain, which are untranslatable into any foreign language whatsoever, so as to present us with their full signification and sense. They have not changed these images into correspondent terms and figures in another language. Thus we have translations in which the words

* For the foregoing, see also Rabinowitz, pp. 193 sqq. above.

† Gudemann (*J.C.R.* pp. 7-9) mentions that Melanchthon was in the habit of prefixing the customary Jewish formula "In the Name of God" or "With the help of God" to his letters and of dating them by Jewish dates, e.g. by the Ninth of Ab, the day on which the Temple was destroyed, or by the day of Alexander's alleged visit to the High Priest Simon. Again, he substitutes ὠρεώνειος for December, which corresponds roughly to the Hebrew month *Kislev* and which he derives, playfully, from *Kesil*, the "brute", "giant", or Orion (Amos v, 8; Job ix, 9; Isa. xiii, 10).

He cites also Luther's lament that "alle Völker, Sonderlich die Juden, halten ihre Kinder besser zur Schule, als die Christen" (*Walch'sche Ausg.* iii, 1818).

indeed are counted, but the thoughts carelessly and dubiously expressed. Hence obscurity, ignorance, uncertainty what to make of the meaning. The still worse consequences follow, of dissension, impudent declamations, upon things which one does not at all understand, and violent invectives against the opponent. For the words being understood according to the rudiments of grammar, but the thoughts not being at all comprehended, the interpreter of the sense, partly out of the shame of confessing his ignorance, partly out of self-love, which makes us more confident than we ought to be, and attempt more than we can accomplish, gives way to assumptions, and to the fabrication of foolish allegories, while he ought to have turned his attention to the investigation of antiquity, and made himself thoroughly conversant with the customs and modes of thinking of each particular age in which the authors may have written and lived.... Then we should have penetrated into the knowledge of the ideas and tropes, the images and figures of speech which meet us at every turn in the books of Scripture, so that there is hardly a single sentence of the Bible that can be opened by any other keys but such as these; then we should have clearly known the thoughts of inspiration, and not rashly substituted our own for the thoughts of Scripture; then, long ago, all uncertainty would have disappeared. I do not say this in a boastful spirit, as if my interpretations had completely opened up the sense, but because I find that my predecessors in interpretation had nowhere been more successful in the work than when they had these resources at hand.¹⁷

In accordance with his principles, Zwingli took instruction in Hebrew from a certain Andrew Boeschenstein, and also from Ceporinus. He also founded a Theological Seminary at Zurich in 1525; and Ceporinus and Conrad Pellican were employed as Professors of Hebrew. Even at the Disputation in Bern, 1528, three

Hebraists, Bullinger, Megander and Pellican, were present; and Zwingli also took great pains to keep in close contact with all the Hebrew publications in other centres.

Luther was a little less enthusiastic; and his attitude to Zwingli was somewhat supercilious. "How I hate people who lug in as many languages as Zwingli does; he spoke Greek and Hebrew in the pulpit at Marburg."

The Hebrew tongue is altogether despised because of impiety, or because people despair of learning it. Without this language there can be no understanding of the Scriptures, for the New Testament, although written in Greek, is full of Hebraisms. It is rightly said that the Hebrews drink from the fountains, the Greeks from the streams, and the Latins from the pools. I am no Hebrew grammarian, nor do I wish to be; for I cannot bear to be hampered by rules, but I am quite at ease in the language; for whoever has the gift of tongues, even though he cannot forthwith turn out anything in another language or interpret it, has a wonderful gift of God.¹⁸

His reliance on the supernatural gift of tongues was probably due to his ignorance of grammar, which he regarded as a Rabbinical concoction, to be studiously avoided. But he was very greatly indebted to Jews for many interpretations which were highly important in his theology.*

* Dr Newman (*J.I.C.* p. 622) sums up his debts as follows: "Luther was indebted to Jews and Judaism through two agencies, which in some respects coincide, namely his personal relation with individual Jews, and his knowledge of Jewish literature. He owed much to the influence of Jewish writings, a fact which can be best noted in his activities as a Hebraist. He shared in the Hebraic revival, initiated by the Humanists, but made possible largely through the contributions of Jewish teachers of Hebrew. Michael Servetus...doubtless learned Hebrew from Spanish

There were, in fact, a number of very important works published about the beginning of the Reformation which were invaluable to all translators of the Bible. A Hebrew Bible was published at Soncino in 1488, and another at Brescia in 1494. There were also Bomberg's Hebrew Bible, 1518, and the Rabbinical Bible, 1518–23. Conrad Pellican's Grammar, 1503; Reuchlin's Dictionary, 1506; Muenster's Grammar, 1525; the Pagninus Latin translation of the Hebrew, 1528, and the *Thesaurus Linguae Sanctae*, 1529; the Complutensian Polyglott, 1517–20: all of which were used by the English translators, and most of which owed their inspiration to contemporary Jews. Among the translators of the Authorized Version, Dr Newman enumerates the following as Christian-taught English Hebraists: Saravia, King, Spalding, Chatterton, Harrison, Byng, Harding, Kilbye, Smith, Bois and Lively. This serves to show how the knowledge of Hebrew had ceased to be a monopoly of the Jews, and how the Christian Hebraic tradition was beginning to be almost self-supporting.

Marranos, and gained as a result great admiration for Jewish controversialists and commentators. In Italy, the brilliant Pico della Mirandola learned Hebrew from Elias del Medigo; Reuchlin studied under Obadiah Sforno, the famous Jewish exegete, and under Jacob ben Jechiel Loans, the Jewish physician to Emperor Frederick III; Elias Levita, the grammarian, taught Johann Eck, Luther's foremost opponent, Sebastian Münster, Cardinal Egidio of Viterbo, the General of the Augustinians, and George de Salve, Bishop of Lavour. Numerous converted Jews assisted in the Hebrew renaissance. Peter Martyr, later Professor of Hebrew in Zurich, gained his knowledge from Italian Jews; Abraham de Balmes publicly taught Hebrew to Italian Christians. To all of these, Luther in a sense is indebted, for they made possible the Hebrew knowledge which, through Christian Hebraists, Luther employed in his translation of the Bible into German."

Jewish Commentaries were no less important than Jewish teachers. The writings of Rashi, Kimhi, Ibn Ezra and others were all available; and they were easily accessible at second-hand through the works of the Christian Hebraists such as Muenster, Pagninus and Reuchlin. The notes appended to Thomas Matthews' Bible, 1537, were based mainly on Jewish authorities; and even more important still was the influence of the works of the Jewish convert Tremellius on the Authorized Version.* Although there were few Jews in England before the Return, yet the influence of Judaism is noteworthy in the early part of the seventeenth century. Even earlier, in the reign of Elizabeth, many sects were consciously adopting Jewish customs and doctrines and were a constant source of worry to the Anglican Reformers. The official attitude of the Church is best illustrated in Thomas Rogers' *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*. Rogers was Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, and his book is in the form of a commentary on the Thirty-Nine Articles, enumerating all the possible deviations from true doctrine under each heading. In dealing with Art. VII (*Of the Old Testament*) he first proves from God's Word that "the judicial laws of the Jews are not necessarily to be received or established in any commonwealth", and then accuses Thomas Cartwright, the intellectual

* Disputations were also an important point of contact between Jews and Christians. These were sometimes friendly, and not always even controversial. *Vide J.A.E.* pp. 7 and 8, for the arguments of Gilbert of Westminster with a Rabbi. This was before 1096. In later times, the disputations generally developed a polemical character. For these see *J.E.* s.v. and also s.v. "Moses ben Nahman". It is interesting to know that Tremellius was a favourite of Queen Elizabeth (*vide H.J.E.* p. 116).

leader of the English Puritans, of desiring to retain them.* Proceeding to a criticism of the rather mysterious Family of Love, he then attributes to Jewish materialism the common belief that Heaven will be set up in this world and will be temporal in nature; and he blames Judaism for leading up to their disbelief in original sin.† He also accuses the sectaries of wishing to revive the Jewish Sabbath.‡

These tendencies were due to study of Hebrew literature rather than to personal contact with Jews. Only a few indications of Judaizing or of Jewish thought can here be noted. In 1624 James Whitehall, of Christ Church, Oxford, was prosecuted for preaching Judaism.¹⁹ Instances of prosecution for conformity to Jewish customs occur, not only in towns but even in villages. Thus, in 1682, at Downham, near Ely, George Washington was "presented" by the Churchwardens to the Bishop for "denying the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and professing himself a Jew": again, in 1684, for refusing to have his children baptized.²⁰ English converts to Judaism sometimes migrated to Holland. But perhaps the most striking instance is seen in the Sabbatarian

* Rogers, *op. cit.* Ed. Parker Soc. Cambridge, 1854, pp. 90 sqq. Cf. Cartwright, *First Reply*, p. 28; *Second Reply*, p. 95. Also Stubs, *Anatomie of Abuses*, London, 1585, p. 82; and Barrow, *Discovery of the False Church*, 1590, p. 96. Cartwright desires "civil punishments, and punishments of the body likewise, appointed by the Word of God, in divers places in Exodus". Stubs asserts that "the law judicial standeth in force to the world's end".

† Cf. Loewe, above, p. 36. Rogers denies that Judaism has anything to do with this doctrine of original sin, p. 97. Cf. also Rogers, *op. cit.* pp. 68, 88, 97.

‡ Rogers, *op. cit.* pp. 89 and 345. Also H. Niklaes, *Evangelium Regni*, London edit. 1652, p. 69. The weightiest Puritan arguments will be found in Nicolas Bownde, *Doctrine of the Sabbath*, London, 1595, esp. in Bk. I, pp. 11, 20, 41.

controversy.* The literature for and against the keeping of the Sabbath is large in extent and serious in argument. Typical pamphlets are those of Christopher Dow, *A Discourse of the Sabbath*, London, 1636; Edward Brerewood, *A Learned Treatise of the Sabbath*, Oxford, 1631. This last was directed against Nicholas Byfield, whose reply, together with Brerewood's rejoinder, are printed in the pamphlet named. Brerewood wrote *A Second Treatise* in the following year. The movement towards Sabbath observance was serious. Servants refused to perform light duties, such as inviting guests, fetching wine from a neighbouring house (i.e. to transgress the Sabbath by carrying burdens) or feeding horses. These instances are mentioned by Brerewood: others occur. The attention of prominent divines was aroused. The Bishop of Ely (Fr. White) wrote a treatise against Sabbatarianism (*A Treatise of the Sabbath Day*, London, 1635); and Prideaux, Divinity Professor at Oxford, "delivered an act", in 1662, entitled "The Doctrine of the Sabbath Day".† Prideaux' Hebrew was sometimes at fault. But he concludes with a note of sound common sense, arguing for the Golden Mean:

It only appertaineth to the Religious Magistrate to prescribe bounds and limits: not to the rash zeale of everyone, which out of schismaticall Stoicisme, not suffering people eyther to use a fanne or to kill a flea, relapse into Judaisme; nor, on the other hand, to every prodigall and debauched companion, who joynes himself unto Belphegor and eats the sacrifices of the dead.

Nothing here need be said of the literal interpreters of Scripture, of the Fifth Monarchy Men, of Manasseh

* See above, p. 127*.

† This ran into a third ed. (London, 1635), which is here cited.

ben Israel's use of the Ten Tribes argument before Cromwell, as a plea for the readmission of the Jews, of the Hebrew learning of such scholars as Selden, Walton, Lightfoot, etc., of Henry More's *Conjectura Cabbalistica*: these are but a few examples which show how well acquainted many Englishmen were not merely with the Hebrew Scriptures, but with Rabbinical literature and Jewish practice.

But there is little point in multiplying the instances in which Christians were influenced by Jewish scholarship in the sixteenth century. The influence was all-pervasive; and it is worked out in very great detail by Dr Newman's exhaustive work. It is more interesting to glance at the exception to the rule, and to note that the compilers of the Douai Bible regarded the Hebrew text as corrupt, and the Jews as perfidious falsifiers of the true version who aimed at the confounding of Catholic Truth.

There was now a new language called Greek, of which people should beware, since it was that which produced all the heresies; that in this language there came forth a book called the New Testament, which was now in everybody's hands, and was full of thorns and briars; that there was also another language, now started up, which they call Hebrew, and that they who learned it were turned into Hebrews. (*J.I.C.* p. 94.)

In one sense at least, the study of Hebrew was rather "thorny" as the Douai compilers pointed out. The question whether the vowel points were in the Mosaic original of the Pentateuch or whether they were later additions, and, if so, whether they were verbally inspired, was the occasion of a controversy which lasted throughout the century. Differences of opinion as to the authenticity

of the pointing might also have very considerable repercussions on the meaning of the text; and the impatient attitude of the Roman Church which led to the Tridentine pronouncement on the infallibility of the Vulgate version is quite understandable from a psychological point of view. And as the controversy hinged round the life of the most distinguished Jewish scholar of the century, Elias Levita,²¹ it is worth noting as the best example of the influence and fortunes of Jewish teachers and scholars.

Levita lived through some of the bitterest persecutions of the Jews in Germany, and carried on his academic work under very great personal disabilities for the greater part of his life. Though he could have secured his own personal safety on account of his steadily growing reputation as the foremost Hebrew biblical critic, he was always faithful to his brethren. When he was invited to accept the Chair of Hebrew at Paris owing to the personal influence of the Bishop of Lavour, he declined on the ground that he could not conscientiously accept office in a country where his kinsmen were persecuted, and from which they were officially expelled. His most secure home was in Venice where he worked with Daniel Bomberg of Antwerp; and where he began his lifelong friendship with George de Selve, afterwards Bishop of Lavour. He also owed much to Egidio of Viterbo. These two friendships meant a great deal in the propagation of Hebrew learning; and by means of the social amenities they secured for him he was enabled to assist in the Hebrew education of all the leading reformers.

After Levita had lost all his possessions in the sack of Padua, 1509, he was employed by Egidio as an

instructor in the Kabbalistic arts, and translated three Kabbalistic texts as well as the *De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis* of Galatinus. But he was not very greatly interested in this sort of theology; so he turned his attention to Hebrew Grammars. Even this was nothing more than a preparation for his life's work, the examination of the vowel points; and at length, in 1538, the *Massoreth Hamassoreth* was published by Bomberg at Venice.*

The effects of this work, which purported to prove that the vowel points were invented by the Massorettes only some five hundred years after Christ, were stupendous. Their authenticity and Mosaic origin had certainly been questioned before; and Jacob Perez de Valencia gave the following amusing and polemical account of their source:

After the conversion of Constantine the Great, the Rabbins perceived that great multitudes of Gentiles embraced Christianity...that the Church prospered very favourably; and that also of the Jews an immense number became convinced of the truth by experience and miracles, whereby their gains and revenues were lessened. Roused by this wickedness, they assembled in great multitudes at the Babylon of Egypt, which is called Cairo, where, with as much secrecy as possible, they falsified and corrupted the Scriptures, and concocted about five or seven points to serve as vowels, these points having been invented by Ravina and Ravashe, two of their doctors. The same Rabbis also concocted the Talmud.... Hence no faith is to be placed in the Holy Scriptures, as the Jews now interpret and punctuate them.²²

But the sixteenth-century scholars paid more attention to "the wicked Rabbis" than the fifteenth-century

* For Levita, see above, Preface, p. xii.

Spanish hermit had done; and Levita's book was of great controversial value. The Protestants, who had been prepared for such a discovery, immediately espoused the new idea; and just as they had rejected the traditions of Rome, so they rejected the biblical traditions of the Rabbis. The Church of Rome, after the first shock, was no less pleased; and Catholic apologists pointed out that God had omitted the points which made the Bible comparatively easy reading in order to keep the interpretation of Scripture in the hands of the clergy. Harding, the great opponent of Bishop Jewel, pointed out that only the Seventy Elders could have been competent to read the Scriptures, and that this safeguarded the authority of ecclesiastical interpretations of their meaning. John Morinus, the French Oratorian, took a similar line. This was a great shock for the Protestants who immediately tried to retreat; and another Anglican, Dr Fulke, pointed out that "seeing our Saviour hath promised that never a prick (a vowel-point) of the Law shall perish, we may understand the same also of the Prophets, who have not received the vowels of the later Jews".²³ The same attitude was followed by the great Buxtorf in the next century. Protestantism could not afford to let the Church of Rome win on such a vital point; the fact that the Bible was intended to be read by all men must be maintained at all costs.

The greatest technical literary controversy of the century was thus started by a Jew.

Jewish literature and scholarship were not of interest merely to controversial and systematic theologians: in the Book of Psalms, Hebrew poetry exercised the greatest possible influence on sixteenth-century literature and

devotion. Even in the Middle Ages the Psalms had been a great spiritual force; exempted by the Council of Toulouse (1220) from the general ban on lay reading of the Old Testament, they were freely translated into the vernacular; and the translation of Richard Rolle of Hampole illustrates one of the spiritual factors leading up to the Reformation. But it was in the sixteenth century that the Psalms really came into their own. Burkhard Waldis of Hesse (1485–1557) versified the whole Psalter, and some of Luther's best-known and most powerful hymns were based on it; while, in opposition to the Lutheran tendency to use the Psalms as the basis of hymns, the Calvinists and Zwinglians regarded the Hebrew Psalter as the only inspired manual of devotional praise. “The more completely the Reformers severed themselves from the Middle Ages, the more completely they swept away the venerable liturgies and beautiful hymns of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, the greater was their reverence for the Psalms, which were the daily bread of the Catholic Clergy.”* But even greater than the influence of the Psalms on Protestant liturgies was their value to Protestant propaganda and morale: metrical versions were one of the chief inspirations of the Huguenots and provided their customary battle-cry; to “chant Psalms” meant, in popular language, to turn Protestant, and when Bishop Godeau translated the Psalms he remarked in his preface that “to know the Psalms by heart is among Protestants a sign of their communion. To our shame it must be said, that in towns

* R. E. Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life*, London, 1903, p. 148. This is the fullest account of the general influence of the Psalms.

or districts where Protestants are numerous, the Psalms are ever on the lips of labourers and artizans, while Catholics are either dumb or sing obscene songs".* It is unnecessary to multiply instances of the use of Psalms in Protestant Devotions: we are all familiar with the picture of the Psalm-singing Puritan, and we may even sympathize with the Earl of Rochester's lament:

Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms,
When they translated David's Psalms,
To make the heart right glad:
But had it been King David's fate
To hear thee sing and them translate,
By God ! 'twould set him mad.†

But the Psalms were more than Puritan anthems: they were also a constant source of inspiration to the Catholic Humanists; they influenced Saint François de Sales as much as Cromwell, and provided one of the few interests shared by Humanist and Reformer alike; even Erasmus loved Luther's translations. Though Montaigne condemned "the promiscuous, rash and indiscreet use of the holy and divine songs which the Holy Spirit inspired in David", they were translated into French verse by courtiers like the Abbé Desportes, Jean Metzeau, Michel de Maurillac and Bishop Godeau, all of whom were trying to emulate the works of Marot. The influence of the Psalms on sixteenth-century literature was considerable: many great humanists from Marot to Racine expressed themselves in poetic translations and paraphrases, and most of

* Cited in Prothero, *op. cit.* p. 200; cf. pp. 179-89.

† Cited in Prothero, *op. cit.* p. 150.

them would have endorsed Sir Walter Raleigh's panegyric:

For his internal gifts and graces, David so far exceeded all other men, and, putting his human frailty apart, he was said by God Himself to be a man according to His own heart. The Psalms which he wrote instance his piety and excellent learning, of whom Jerome to Paulina: "David", saith he, "our Simonides, Pindarus, and Alcaeus, Horatius, Catullus and Serenus, playeth Christ on his harp, and on a ten-stringed lute raiseth Him up rising from the dead. And being both king and prophet, he fortelleth Christ more lightsomely and lively than all the rest."*

(3) Jewish theology also had a considerable influence in the sixteenth century. As soon as Zwingli began to study the Scriptures, he realised "How Jerome twists the Gospel in regard to invocation or intercession of the Saints"; and he shared this impression with most of the other Reformers. Nor was the distrust of the old exegesis limited to any single doctrine.

The essentially historical attitude of Zwingli made it quite clear to him that if the Christian Church was in covenant with God so as to inherit the promises of

* Cited in Prothero, *op. cit.* p. 168.

Marot's translation of Thirty Psalms received the royal licence on 30 November 1541. In 1560 there was published the Genevan edition, based on Marot, which was the foundation of the Reformed Churches' worship. Other humanists who translated or edited the Psalms include Olivetan (1537), Etienne Dolet (Lyons, 1542), Henri I Estienne (1509). England was also provided with the translations of Sternhold and Hopkins (1548 and 1557), and the first complete version, a composite work, was published by Daye in 1562, and was in general use in the Anglican Church till the end of the seventeenth century. Francis Bacon himself published *Certaine Psalmes written in Sickness* in 1624, dedicated to George Herbert. No one who has had the misfortune to read these could possibly believe that he wrote the plays of Shakespeare.

the Old Testament, the new covenant was related to the old only analogically. This is clear from the fact that the Jews obviously inherit the Old Promises; and as the Synagogue and the Church are rival organizations, they cannot both be the Chosen People. Zwingli did not hesitate, therefore, to assert that the New Covenant gave the Church an unique status, and revoked the Old Covenant with the Jews. Most Catholics would have agreed with him in this respect; but he went on to say that fasting laws in particular, and even ritual in general were out of date; and he accused the Churches of excessive ritual. He followed this up with a justification of the Jewish attitude to images; hence "as the Jews do not carry images, nor do the Zwinglians or the Calvinists". Judaism had always provided one of the main incentives to iconoclasm in the Christian Church; and the part played by individual Jews in the Iconoclastic Controversy had been considerable. But with regard to images in the Reformation, the Lutheran and Zwinglian Churches reacted differently to the Jewish doctrine. As Schaff remarks:

The Swiss Reformers proceeded on a strict construction of the second commandment as understood by Jews and Moslems. They regarded all kinds of worship paid to images and relics as a species of idolatry. They opposed chiefly the paganism of popery; while Luther attacked its *legalistic* Judaism, and allowed the pictures to remain as works of art and helps to devotion.²⁴

Zwingli's doctrine of the Holy Communion, like his attitude to symbolism in general, owed much to Jewish interests. Most of the Reformers who were good Hebraists drew a close parallel between the Sacraments of the Old and New Covenants: Circumcision and the

Passover; Baptism and the Holy Communion. And as the Passover had come to be regarded as purely commemorative, the Holy Communion was interpreted similarly.*

Zwingli was under grave suspicion of much worse heresy than this, however; he was accused of having adopted the Jewish view of the person of Christ under the influence of Moses of Winterthur, and expressing doctrines dangerously similar to those of Servetus. He vigorously denied the charge, but there is reason to suppose that his general semi-Pelagianism was slightly tinged with a Nestorian Christology, or at least the germs thereof.

Servetus, however, was unquestionably an Adoptianist and a Unitarian; and his Christology was derived no less from his acquaintance with Jewish interpretations of the Messianic texts than from his general rationalism. Nobody else went nearly so far as he did to show these texts in their real historical setting; and though he was prepared to admit that in one sense they might show the aspirations which were to be fulfilled in the historical Jesus, he was quite definite in his assertion that the

* *Vide C. H. Smyth, Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI, Cambridge, 1926, p. 21:* "The Body and Blood of Christ, they argued, could not have been in the Sacraments of the Old Law, because he had not yet been born: but Christ is in no other way present in the Sacraments of the Church than he was present in the Sacraments of the Mosaic Law: therefore the Sacraments of the Church and the Sacraments of the Law are both merely symbolic of his body and blood offered upon the Cross for man's redemption, the former in a commemorative, the latter in a prophetic sense, and Christ is in no way present in the Eucharist than he is present in baptism or was present in the Passover. It was a matter of profound consequence that the Church of Zurich at this period came partly under the influence of such learned Hebraists as Leo Judae, Pellican and Bibliander."

writers were referring to persons living in their own time. This interpretation of Isa. liii, for example, was completely revolutionary, and Servetus is revealed as the first Christian higher critic.*

Nor did he hesitate to draw theological conclusions from his opinion on this point. He also believed in an immanentist theology based on Maimonides. Combining his biblical history with his theology he determined that the pre-existence of Christ could mean no more than that the idea of Christ was in God's mind since the Creation; that His Divinity was to be interpreted entirely in terms of immanence, God's Shekinah dwelling in Him; and that we cannot construct any doctrine of the Trinity more precise than the Trinity of Wisdom, Intelligence and Knowledge which is allegorized in Proverbs. The idea of the Hypostatic Union he regarded as metaphysical nonsense; and he lamented the ease with which Jewish thinkers could destroy the Christian theories on the point. The Trinity of Calvin he described as a three-headed Cerberus.

Servetus was certainly one of the best historians of the sixteenth century. But he was certain to be con-

* On the question of the interpretation of this chapter, see the splendid pair of volumes containing a *catena* of commentaries (*The Fifty Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Commentators*, S. R. Driver and A. Neubauer, Oxford, 1877). In a scholarly introduction, Pusey evaluates these comments and compares Christian exegesis. A similar *catena* is Ad. Posnanski's *Schiloh* (on Gen. xl ix, 10), Leipzig, 1904.

The use of the Jewish Messianic tradition in support of Christianity troubled even the great Catholic theologian Cardinal Cajetan. "Was not Cajetane a pillar of your Church?... Doth not this famous Cardinal of Rome set down in plain words that 'the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews doth gather insufficient arguments to prove Christ to be the Son of God?'" (Whitaker, *Answer to Rainold*, London, 1585, cap. i, p. 7).

demned. Not only did he identify the Suffering Servant with Cyrus instead of Christ; he also argued against the veracity of the Old Testament on the grounds that Canaan never was a land of milk and honey, and that the Jews had never made a reasonable success of their life there; and he concluded by submitting the Mystery Religion hypothesis as an explanation of many distinctive Christian tenets, identifying the Catholic Madonna with the Mother Goddesses of Egypt. He then advocated, as a matter of practical policy, that Trinitarian doctrines should be abandoned in order that the Jews might be more easily converted.*

In pure philosophy, Servetus was an extreme immanentalist, tending to pantheism; and Saisset regards him as the precursor of Malebranche, Spinoza, Schleiermacher and Strauss. He was probably not quite so confused as all that. But he was certainly less tainted with dualism than any of his contemporaries; he held an organic view of history as a living process rather than a compendium of edifying and dead precedents; and he was unusually interested in the study of religious experience in all its manifestations. He was the child of liberal and enlightened Marrano Judaism.

(4) The last instance of Jewish influence on the Renaissance which it is necessary to consider is that of the Kabbalah and the Zohar. This is a very controversial subject, as the term Kabbalism has been applied to so many things, and Kabbalistic influence found not only in Neoplatonic mysticism and allegorical exegesis, but also in Freemasonry, Rosicrucianism, and modern theosophy.

* *Vide Beza, Epistolae, Geneva, 1575, Ep. lxxxii, p. 328.*

It is true that many people in the sixteenth century were interested in the magical Kabbalah, and in magic in general; this interest was particularly congenial in the Germany whose religious neuroses we have noted above.

But it is the mystical Kabbalah that is the more important as a serious influence on serious thinkers. It represented one of the historic forms of Gnosticism; attempting to reconcile the infinity and transcendence of God with His immanence in Nature, and with the inherence of His Form in the Supernal Soul of Man. As such, the obvious theories of Absorption of the Soul into the Absolute, which are common to most philosophical mysticism, are all to be found in the Kabbalah.

This sort of mysticism attracted Reuchlin in Germany and Pico della Mirandola in Italy; and the Kabbalah was a greater impetus to Hebrew study than even the Scriptures themselves. But most scholars were interested principally in the extraction of Christian doctrine from Hebrew writings by the Kabbalistic methods of exegesis. For it was believed that the Jews knew the "real" meaning of the Scriptures, but had been obliged to hide them in esoteric writings. For the historian to whom the Kabbalistic technique is a closed book, it is these attempts on the part of Christian scholars to find a new interpretation of the Old Testament by means other than ordinary historical criticism that have the greatest interest. Reuchlin found the doctrine of the Trinity in the first verse of Genesis; and Mirandola tried to prove the Divinity of Christ by similar means. But most interesting of all is the way in which the Zohar bore witness to the Atonement. This certainly strengthened Protestant faith in the newer Protestant

ideas of Atonement. But Ginsburg may possibly be right when he asserts that all such attempts will be deprecated by all persons who have the slightest regard for the laws of language.

But if Kabbalism is interpreted as a sort of dynamic immanentism, like the ideas of Bergson, and shorn of its cruder features, Dr Saurat may also be right in seeing its influence in the poetry of Milton and the philosophy of Spinoza.*

NOTES

TO CHAPTER VII

¹ *Kab.* p. 210.

² David de Sola Pool, "The influence of Some Apostates on the Protestant Reformation" in *Jewish Review*, 1911.

³ *J.L.* p. 431.

⁴ Ginsburg, Introduction to Levita's *Massoreth Hamassoreth*, London, 1867, p. 6.

⁵ Vide Kayserling, *Christopher Columbus and the Participation of the Jews in Spanish and Portuguese Discoveries*.

⁶ For Censorship see *C.H.B.* and *J.E.* s.v. "Censorship".

⁷ For a full account of the activity of the censors, *vide* J. A. Symonds, *The Counter-Reformation in Italy*, London, 1910.

⁸ *The Talmud*, London, 1932, pp. 103 sqq.

⁹ Cited in *C.H.B.* p. 20.

¹⁰ *C.H.B.* pp. 35–6.

¹¹ *J.C.R.* p. 6.

¹² *Vide* Margaret James, *Social Policy during the Puritan Revolution* London, 1930, p. 22.

¹³ Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, London, 1930, pp. 204–11.

¹⁴ *Quaest. quodlibet al.* VII, art. 17c.

¹⁵ On this term, see *J.C.R.* p. 3.

¹⁶ *Vide* Soury, *Des Etudes Hébraïques et Exégétiques au Moyen Age chez les Chrétiens d'Occident*, Paris, 1867, p. 10.

* On this see Denis Saurat, *Literature and Occult Tradition*, Eng. trs. London, 1930; *Milton, Man and Thinker*, London, 1924.

¹⁷ I am indebted to Dr L. I. Newman for the translation.

¹⁸ Luther, *Table Talks*, London, 1915, p. 219.

¹⁹ *H.J.E.* p. 123.

²⁰ Quarterly Returns of Parish Churchwardens to the Bishop, Ely Muniment Room, marked D, 2.

²¹ See above, Preface, pp. xii sqq.

²² Ginsburg, Introd. to *Massoreth Hamassoreth*, p. 47.

²³ Fulke, *Works*, Parker Soc. ed. p. 578.

²⁴ *Church History*, vii, 59.

CHAPTER VIII

CASUISTRY: JEWISH AND JESUIT DIALECTICS

BY

H. F. STEWART

CHAPTER VIII

CASUISTRY: JEWISH AND JESUIT DIALECTICS

My subject this afternoon is casuistry, or the solving of cases of conscience, at two different periods of history, by two different schools of thought and practice.* Casuistry is of two kinds, (*a*) simple or natural, (*b*) scientific or theological. It bears a bad name to-day (since Pascal's attack in the *Provincial Letters* in 1656) because of abuse of the second kind. Simple casuistry is as old as the hills or as the dawn of conscience, and it is as natural as lying, to which it often leads. When the child says "Mother, mayn't I have that doll?" and Mamma answers "No, dear, it belongs to your sister, and you know it would be wrong to take it", casuistry is employed. Every mistress who writes a character for a maid, or tutor who writes a testimonial for a pupil, or lawyer who gives advice to a client, or judge who interprets statute law, or advertiser who prepares a puff or "blurb", is apt to have recourse to casuistry. We all practise it every day of our lives, e.g. at the telephone, or the writing-table, seeking an excuse for accepting or declining an invitation. Scientific casuistry is a special development of simple casuistry. It is the science or art whereby a recognized authority or teacher decides whether a particular act, performed or contemplated, falls within the scope of a general

* I am much indebted to Mr Loewe for the Rabbinic references. For the Jesuit side I have borrowed freely from my edition of the *Lettres provinciales*, Manchester University Press, 1920.

moral rule. You are in doubt whether such and such an act is forbidden or allowed in conscience, whether there is, in respect of it, any law restricting your liberty, or whether there is no law, and you are free.

Such questions were canvassed in antiquity by the Stoics, who were the great arbiters of moral action. You will find instances in Cicero, especially in his treatise *De officiis*.

But it was the Jews, and, in particular, the Pharisees, aiming at the strict fulfilment of the Divine Law (the Torah), and at bringing the whole of life into accordance therewith, who developed the treatment of cases of conscience about which there can be doubt, into a veritable art. But hardly to a science, such as the Christian Church evolved in the course of the Middle Ages, culminating in the practice of the Society of Jesus,* and continuing at about the same level to the present day under the title of Moral Theology. Pascal cursed it and seemed to have crushed it, but when the dust of controversy cleared away, the Jesuit flag was still flying on the fort, and St Alfonso Liguori is still a name to conjure with, a guide to follow safely, in the Roman communion. I deliberately leave aside the casuistry of the Reformed Churches (although, here in Cambridge, where Joseph Hall and William Perkins and Jeremy Taylor were trained, it is a tempting topic), because it was never reduced to a system, and, I may

* But it must be noted that the Jesuits, like all other priests, distinguished sharply their "casuistry" from the quest for holiness. The main question in "casuistry", i.e. in the work of the confessional, is what must be imposed upon the Catholic penitent as a grave obligation, not what is the best and holiest thing for him to do. He must be obliged to the former, but encouraged to the latter.

claim, never courted such severe criticism as the Jesuits earned in the seventeenth century. Apart from that, Rabbinical and Jesuitical casuistry offer comparison and contrast sufficient for the pastime of an afternoon.

Direct borrowing is to my mind out of the question; it is hardly likely that the rather tawdry and pinchbeck successors of Pharisaic casuists, the Pilpulists of the sixteenth century, should have sharpened their wits on Christian whetstones, or vice versa; while the mediæval churchmen, who declared that to learn Hebrew was to turn Jew, can scarcely have sought help from the Talmud which they burnt wholesale without reading!*

Loans on the one side or the other need be looked for only when our common human nature fails to supply an explanation, and it seems to me that just as beasts and birds of the same genus all the world over behave alike, so human beings at the same stage of mental and moral development and under similar conditions will think and act pretty much in the same way. And here, making all allowance for the growth of civilization, you have at least similar conditions of mind, viz. devotion to Law and desire to make it easy rather than difficult for men to fulfil. For the Pharisees, Law took the place of dogma—nay, it contained all dogma. Ps. cxix is a faint expression of their feeling

* *Les Juifs en France*, by I. Bédarride, Paris, 1860, pp. 351, 559 (35); *J.L.* p. 430; Dudley Wright in *The Talmud*, London, 1932, has a special *excursus* containing a list of the various burnings of the Talmud.

Mr Ashe Lincoln, in his illuminating *excursus* in *S.C.B.M.* vol. II, has made it highly probable that the Jews in England influenced Common Law for its good between 1066 and 1290, e.g. in the matter of mortgages and “elegit”; but I am unaware of anything of the kind in Spain, where Jesuitry took its rise, or in France, where it chiefly flourished.

towards it. Dr Claude Montefiore has said, and I imagine all faithful Jews would subscribe to the saying, “In orthodox Judaism the Law supplied the place which the Person of Christ occupies in Christianity. It was the almost living link between the human and the divine.”¹

The Society of Jesus was also devoted to Law, “the law of the mediaeval church, full of details and demands. It had originated in the Church from its desire to save souls, to keep them from evil; but it grew, as law always tends to grow, developing and hardening, having interwoven with it the self-interest of worldly men, and moulded by human intolerance and presumption.”² And those who followed it had the same ambition as those who followed the Law of the Old Covenant, viz. to make it cover all conditions of life. Both Pharisees and Jesuits were aware of the difficulties of the Law in which they delighted, and both were anxious to make the application of it as smooth as possible. On the one hand, you have the principle of *Tirḥa de-Sibbura*,* i.e., things which are a

* [Lit. “Burden of the Congregation”. Thus, “Rabb chanced to be in Babylon on a fast day and omitted the final benediction...because he was unwilling to burden the congregation...” (*T.B. Meg. 22 b* (Germ. trs. *G. III*, 629)). Or again, God said to Israel, “With regard to my πρόσταγμα, I have not burdened you (*הטרכתִּי*) by ordaining that you must read the *Shema*‘ when standing...but rather sitting in your houses or walking by the way” (*Lev. R. xxvii, §6* (Germ. trs. *W. p. 189*)). The following passage is significant:

“After the Temple was destroyed, the ‘Separated Ones’ [those who practised self-restraint: the word is used in a wider sense than ‘Pharisee’ with which it is identical in form] increased in Israel; they ate no meat, and drank no wine. Then R. Joshua went to them and said, ‘Why do you eat no meat and drink no wine?’ They said, ‘How can we eat meat, when it was offered

“burden on the public” must be avoided, “we must not decree on the public more than it can bear”;³ and, on the other, the practice which led Bossuet to write concerning the Jesuits “they put cushions under the elbows of their penitents”. All this was humane and harmless. It was good and right of them, believing, on the one hand, in an infallible word of God, and, on the other, in an infallible Church, to show how easy the yoke of the law really was and how delightful the burden, saving from sin and saving from Hell. Casuistry, as I have already hinted, through which peace and certitude are brought to a troubled conscience, is a blessed thing. It is harmful only when casuist and enquirer combine in an attempt to evade law and continue in wrongdoing, when, to use the words with which Bossuet completes his description of the Society of Jesus, “they find excuse for their sinful passions”.⁴ And it may be said at once that the occasions upon which evasion of the Law is advised or practised by daily on the altar, or drink wine which was poured out on it? And now all this has ceased.’ He said to them, ‘In that case we ought to eat no figs and grapes, for they were offered as firstlings, and we ought to eat no bread, because they used to bring two loaves on Pentecost, and the shewbread on every Sabbath, and we ought to drink no water, for there was a libation of water at the feast of Tabernacles.’ They were silent. He said, ‘Not to mourn at all is impossible; to mourn more than is adequate is also not possible.’ For R. Joshua had said before, ‘Only such decrees must be issued which the majority of the community can endure’” (*Midr. Ps. cxxxvii*, § 3, 262b *fin.*, 263a (Germ. trs. *W. p. 226*); *T.B. Bab.B. 60b* (Germ. trs. *G. vi, 1102*)).]

[The following saying is illustrative: “Any decree which the Court may impose on the Public but which the majority of the Public have failed to adopt, ceases to be a decree” (*T.J. Sabb. i, § 1, f. 3d, line 27* (French trs. *S. iv, 20*)). R. Yohanan reports this principle as an old tradition (**מקובל אני**) and an instance of repudiation is given.]

the Pharisees or their immediate successors are extremely rare, and for the most part quite trivial.

The terms of my subject forbid my wandering, even if I were competent, into the wilderness of *She'eloth u-Teshuboth*, the questions and answers, the *responsa prudentium*, addressed to and dealt with by Rabbis and *Geonim* throughout the Middle Ages, and continued down to the present day. If I mention the Tanna Rabbi Me'ir, it is only to hint at the subtleties of which a second-century Rabbi was capable. He could supply, we are told, 150 reasons proving a thing legally clean, and as many more proving it unclean.* No wonder that his disciples were perplexed—no wonder that he seemed not to know his own mind.†

I confine myself in the main to the Mishnah, which contains enough and to spare to occupy us for the first half of my time.

Let me give from the Mishnah five examples—and they are the only ones—of what the Rabbis call '*Ormah*',‡ cunning, subtlety or cleverness in dealing with precepts of the Torah, for which they are derided by certain Protestant theologians.

(1) *On the second tithe.* There were three tithes in

* [As a matter of fact, Rabbi Me'ir was not so exceptional, because we read that even school-children too young to know the meaning of sin were capable of expounding the Law in 49 ways "clean" and in 49 ways "unclean": it is saddening to read that these infant prodigies died young because they were addicted to the sin of delation. See Midrash *Shohet Tobi* on Ps. xii, §4, ed. Buber, f. 54b (Germ. trs. W. p. 109). It need hardly be pointed out that these statements are hyperbolical.]

† [But, in point of fact, in the Gemara the arguments were generally summed up and a decision reached.]

‡ See H. Loewe's Appendix II, pp. 380 sqq. to *R.T.* [But for a masterly treatment, see Schechter's appendix to *Hibbert Lectures*. H.L.]

Jewish Law, the "First Tithe", of all agricultural produce, paid to support the ministry of the Temple; the "Second Tithe", to be consumed every two years out of four by the farmer and his family (including dependents) in a festive banquet at Jerusalem; and the "Third", or "Poor Tithe", which replaced the "First Tithe" in the second and sixth year of the seven-year cycle. We are concerned here only with the Second Tithe, *Ma'aser Sheni*. To save the expense of transporting the produce from the country to the capital, this Second Tithe might be commuted for cash, plus one-fifth of the value of the produce. Now, in order to escape this additional one-fifth, the Mishnah speaks as follows: "Men may act with cunning in what concerns Second Tithe. Thus, a man may say to his son or daughter that is of age, or to his Hebrew bondman or bondwoman, 'Here is money: do thou redeem this Second Tithe.' But he cannot speak thus to his son or daughter that are minors, or to his Canaanite bondman or bondwoman, since their hand is as his hand."⁵

The effect of this relief was that there was more money to be spent in the feast and to give the family, as Mr Loewe says, "a better time". The one-fifth passed from the farmer's pocket into, shall we say, the maw of his family.

The farmer gets something of his own back, however, in the next opportunity of *Klughandeln* given by the Mishnah. "Or if he was standing on his threshing floor and had no money in his hand, he might say to his fellow 'This produce is given thee as a gift', and say moreover, 'Let this be redeemed by money that is in the house.'"⁶

In this way he gives no money for redemption, but simply gives the produce, and, as the produce is now given away, he avoids the payment of the one-fifth.

(2) *The Sabbath*. What happens if a fire breaks out on the Sabbath, when no work may be done and no labour employed? *Shabbath* xvi, 3 gives a ruling which involves 'Ormah, or cleverness, subtlety, acting cleverly.⁷

"They may save a basketful of loaves even though it is enough for a hundred meals; or a cake of figs or a jar of wine. One man may say to others 'Come and save food for yourselves', and, if they were prudent, they made their reckoning with him after the Sabbath," i.e. they gave back the food they saved for him and received a suitable reward for their labour.

(3) *Firstlings*. The Law laid down that every firstling should be dedicated, i.e. sacrificed to the Lord, its blood sprinkled on the altar, its fat consumed by fire, and its flesh bestowed upon the priest. The Mishnah, s.v. *Temurah* v, 1, asks frankly "How can the law of Firstlings be evaded?"⁸ and thus (though it does not specify the object) deprive the priest of his perquisite. And the answer is that when a cow is in calf for the first time, you may, if the calf proves to be a bull, devote it as a whole burnt offering (in which case the priest gets the skin only), if a heifer, you may devote it as a peace offering (when the priest gets the breast and shoulder). This ingenious, anti-clerical, action, which is in flat contradiction with Lev. xxvii, 26, where it is expressly forbidden that firstlings should be dedicated to any purpose but the Lord's, was casuistically justified. After the offspring is born, it must be dedicated to the Lord, but before birth it may be otherwise dedicated!

(4) *Fraudulent fulfilment of a Nazarite vow.* "If a man says 'I will be a Nazarite and I pledge myself to bring the hair of another Nazarite' and his fellow hears him and says 'I, too, will do the same', then if they are cunning (so runs the precept *Nazir* II, 5)⁹ they each bring the hair of the other, and so escape the two additional hair-offerings to which they pledged themselves", and so, we may add, fulfil their vow cheaply.

(5) The last case is one familiar to us from Matt. XII, 11, where Jesus rebuts the accusation of breaking the Sabbath through an act of mercy by a reference to the Pharisee's own act of mercy in breaking the Sabbath law by rescuing a beast from a pit on the Sabbath. On this it is enough to say that the Pharisees themselves held that the Sabbath was made for man, and were always prepared to break it for the sake of saving life.*

* [On this, see vol. I, pp. 166sqq. The following citations may also be noted:

(1) On Sabbath, life must be saved and urgent public affairs transacted (*T.B. Keth.* 5a (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 469)).

(2) Saving of life takes precedence of Sabbath (*T.B. Yoma* 85a (Germ. trs. *G.* II, 1016) in case of Jew or Gentile).

(3) Where saving of life is concerned, one does not inquire whether more pagans or Jews are involved (*T.B. Keth.* 15b (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 504)).

(4) Nothing must intervene (be pretermitted) in the case of life-saving save idolatry, unchastity, or murder (*T.B. Keth.* 19a (Germ. trs. *G.* iv, 515)).

(5) On Lev. xxv, 35-6, "thy brother shall live *with* thee", Ben Peṭori gave this exposition: if two are in the desert and one alone has water, just enough for himself, they must share it and die, for "thy brother" must live *with* thee. But Akiba interpreted "with thee" otherwise, he stressed *thee*, not *with*, i.e., thy brother must live together with thee and not without thee. He has no legitimate claim to ask thy life. In point of law, therefore, in such a contingency, thine own life comes first (*Sifra* 109c). These are, of course, legal, not ethical expositions. The principle of self-sacrifice is not here under discussion; for that idea cf. *T.B. Ber.*

Their objection to Jesus's action was that a withered arm involved no immediate danger to life, and that the cure might just as well be postponed till after the Sabbath. *Per contra*, Jesus held that no act of mercy, whether the need was pressing or not, should be postponed because of the Sabbath rest.

I cannot help here remarking on the curious parallel between Pharisaic and Jansenist practice. The Jansenists were insistent on an interval between absolution of a penitent and his admission to the Holy Communion, which led to hardship in some cases, e.g. the dying Pascal, who craved for the Sacrament and was kept from it again and again by his Jansenist physicians, who argued that he could perfectly well wait till he could come to church in the ordinary way to receive what he was clamouring for in his chamber and at once.

These instances of '*Ormah*' are trivial enough. Much more serious is the recourse to legal fiction. The object of legal fiction, which is a common feature of Roman law and of English law and of Jewish law, is to adjust the law without sacrificing principle, the law itself being regarded by each system as immutable. English common law is full of it, and, as Maine says in *Ancient Law*,¹⁰ legal fictions are almost a necessity of the law at a certain stage of human development. "They satisfy the desire for improvement; at the same time they do not offend the superstitious relish of change."*

32a (Eng. trs. C. p. 213), on Moses' plea "blot me from Thy book", *et al.*

(6) Justifiable homicide: see *Sanh.* viii, 7 (Eng. trs. D. p. 395) and *J.E.* s.v. "Homicide".]

* Cf. *In fictione legis semper subsistit aequitas*: Blackstone in *Enc. Brit.* 11th ed. s.v. "Fictions", p. 319a, an interesting article. Cf. also Hastings, *E.R.E.* s.v. "Judaism", p. 568. See above, p. 52.

Abundant instances can be quoted, in the shape of allegations which one of the parties in a dispute made and the other was not allowed to deny, in order that the new wine of new law might be put into the bottles of old procedure. A grotesque example was that by which, for the purpose of giving a remedy in England for a wrong done in the Mediterranean, it was alleged that the Island of Minorca was in London in the Parish of St Mary le Bow in the Ward of Cheap!

A reasonable example is the case of infant baptism, where the will of the infant is attributed to the god-parents. In Judaism legal fictions grew luxuriantly and were, as Mr Abrahams¹¹ confesses, occasionally detrimental to the cause of morality. Sometimes it is hard to see how the Jews could have existed in the Middle Ages without some abbreviation of strict observance of precept, and we know from Rabbi Rabinowitz that custom overrides law.* Thus the

* [See above, pp. 210 sqq. In a case where the law was in doubt, it was said to the questioner "Go and observe how the Congregation (*Sibbür*) acts and act accordingly" (*T.J. Ma'aser Sh.* v. § 3, f. 56b, line 6 and *Pe'ah* vii, § 6, f. 20 c, line 21 (French trs. *S.* ii, 102)).]

The following parable illustrates the force of custom. In Gen. xviii, 8 it is recorded that Abraham set food before the Angels "and they did eat". On this, the Midrash observes: "But angels do not eat!" "Well, this teaches one decent behaviour, that one should never depart from local custom. This lesson, too, is learnt from Moses, who, when he went on high, did not eat for forty days (Exod. xxxiv, 28). Had there been food on high, he would have eaten. Wherever you go, fall in with your host's usage" (*Tanh.*, vay-Yera, § 11, f. 36a (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 130)).

In '*Ab. Zar.* i, 6 (Eng. trs. *E.* p. 11) it is laid down: "The sale of small animals to the heathen is permitted at a place where this is customary: it is forbidden at a place where this is not the custom. Let no man alter this for fear of controversy!" For trade custom, see *T.B. Hullin* 94a top (Germ. trs. *G.* viii, 1108). On the force of *Minhag* (custom), see Schechter, *Studies*, i, 234.]

sections of the Mishnah entitled '*Erubhin*'¹² (mixing or fusion of Sabbath limits) permits or suggests a fiction whereby the prohibition to carry anything in or out of a house on the Sabbath can be safely evaded. There is no prohibition against carrying from one room to another in the same house, even though it be occupied by more than one family. If there are several houses set together round a central court, you may make one house of them by erecting a temporary entrance door, however flimsy.* Or you can make a partnership (*shittuf*) by placing a vessel of food jointly with your neighbour in an alley between your house and his, and making the whole area where the *shittuf* is into one domicile. Less innocent (though not very mischievous) is the fiction whereby you escape the prohibition of Jer. xvii, 22, where the individual may not transport anything in or out of a house on the Sabbath. An action which an individual may not do may be shared between two and both are blameless.¹³

Another fiction, which serves a definitely useful purpose as preserving a principle while evading the strict letter, is that of an '*Erubh Tabhshilin*' about cooking on or for the Sabbath. You must not cook on Sabbath save for warming up what is already cooked. But on a festival which lasts two days you may cook "that which is essential for food" (cf. Exod. xii, 16). But you may cook only for the festival itself, not for the following day. But suppose a festival ends on Friday? What about food for the morrow which is Sabbath? The '*Erubh*' in question has the following concession. Before the festival begins a plate of cooked food is set aside and kept with the recital of a formula. This is

* On this, see vol. I, p. 174, note 1.

a symbolic preparation for the Sabbath, which has begun before the festival. This serves as a reminder that on festivals in the ordinary course only cooking for the day itself may be undertaken.¹⁴

Prosbul. There is one legal fiction, involving a definite evasion of a Mosaic law which deserves particular attention as illustrating the principle of *Tirha de-Sibbura*, and that is the so-called *Prosbul*.¹⁵ When Hillel, advocate of leniency, came to be head of a school in Jerusalem, he found the conditions there different from those which he had known in Babylonia. Laws which had no force "outside the Land" had only an academic interest, and tradition concerning them had not the binding force required by Palestinian teachers. He was, therefore, naturally prepared to adapt the laws, where possible, to existing circumstances. Now the law of Deut. xv, ordering a septennial release of all loans, was doubtless a benevolent enactment in the society for which it was framed, when loans were meant to be merely charitable aids in time of need. When, later, loans were wanted for commercial purposes, the Deuteronomistic regulation became a simple nuisance, defeating its own purpose. The relief to a borrower became so complete that, however much he wanted to borrow, he could not do so for the simple reason that no one would lend in the sixth year knowing that the loan would be cancelled in the seventh. So Hillel invented the *Prosbul*, προσβολή, a document signed and sealed before a judge, whereby the lender preserved his right to call in his debt whenever he pleased, irrespective of the fallow year. The Court, instead of the individual, became the creditor, and all was well.

An interesting statement, going back to Resh Lakish

(c. A.D. 240), contrasts God's action with the 'Ormah of a mortal ruler who is פָלָמִיטָם (i.e. πολύμητις). The ruler makes the subject work six days for the ruler and one for himself, the subject. But God does the reverse. He asks only for the Sabbath. (*Pes.R.* xxiii, 116a and note 16.)

Protestant critics, e.g. Strack and Billerbeck, who say much about the five instances of 'Ormah, or acting cleverly, just quoted, say little or nothing about *Kawwanah*, the inward intention, and *Lishmah*, for its namesake, i.e. a thing must be done seriously and without *arrière pensée*, which are conditions laid down by the Mishnah for the performance of the law.*

* [The following extract from *Lev.R.* x, § 1 (Germ. trs. *W.* p. 62) shows how 'Ormah was hateful to God and how God himself has to decide which course of action is right, in other words, have recourse to casuistry. "R. Judah in the name of R. Azariah said: 'When Abraham prayed to God to show compassion upon the men of Sodom, he said, "Thou has sworn never to bring again a flood of water upon the earth. Dost Thou now propose to bring a flood of fire, and so cleverly to evade the oath? Thou canst not get out of the oath, as it is said, far be it from Thee to do after this manner. Shall not the judge of all the earth do justice? Yet if Thou wantest justice, then the world cannot stand, but if Thou wantest the world (to endure), then justice cannot stand [i.e. then Thou canst not have perfect justice]. Thou seekest to grasp the cord by both ends at once: Thou desirest (to maintain) the world, and Thou desirest truthful judgement; if Thou dost not yield a little, Thy world cannot endure.'" Then God said to Abraham: "Thou lovest justice and hatest evil (Ps. xlvi, 7); thou lovest to justify My creatures, and thou hatest to declare them guilty, therefore hast God anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows" (Ps. xlvi, 7)."] (*Lev.R.* x, § 1.)

It should be noted that 'Ormah is a biblical word. It occurs in the sense of "craftiness" at Exod. xxii, 14 and Jos. ix, 4, and in a good sense (= "prudence") at Prov. i, 4; viii, 5, 12. The serpent was 'Arum and there may be a *paronomasia* here, since naked (e.g. Adam and Eve) is also 'Arum, though from another root.

In addition to the safeguards against evasion already noted

I too will keep silence about them till we come to compare Jewish with Jesuit casuistry, to which I now pass.

(*Kawwanah* and *Lishmah*) mention might be made of the following:

(1) A commandment must not be fulfilled by means of a sin (*Miswah hab-Ba'ah ba'averah*).

(2) The spirit not the letter (*Iqqar* and *Tafel*).

(3) "Things left to the heart." This phrase is used for things which are left to the conscience. A farmer must leave the corner of his field to the poor. "Corner" is a vague term: the measure is left to the individual's sense of generosity and it is only the excess which has to be deprecated. Usually "things left to the heart" are said to be indicated in the Bible by the phrase "and thou shalt fear thy God". A good example may be seen in *T.B. Kid.* 32b (Germ. trs. *G.* v, 806). It says in *Lev. xix*, 32, "Thou shalt rise up before a greybeard"; but suppose you pretend you haven't seen him? No, this is one of the things left to the heart. Or again, *T.B. Bab.M.* 58b (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 675) on *Lev. xxv*, 17, "Ye shall not vex one another"—not merely in money but even by words. For example, do not say to a penitent "remember your former sins", or to a proselyte "the mouth that once ate pig, now speaks Torah". If your friend falls sick or into misfortune or buries his son, don't comfort him after the manner of Job's friends. If chapmen (lit. ass-drivers) wish to buy fodder, don't say to them "go to so-and-so for it", when you know that he doesn't sell fodder. Or again, if you have no money, don't gaze into a shop window and raise the shop-keeper's hopes of a customer. All these are "things left to the heart".

In the forthcoming *Rabbinic Anthology* Dr Montefiore cites the following passage about "things left to the heart":

"The law, 'Thou shalt not set a stumbling block before the blind,' is extended to mean, 'You must not hide part of your intention in giving advice to a man.' You must not say, 'Sell your field, and buy a donkey,' when you are really intending to circumvent him, and get his field [i.e. by buying his field from him]. Perhaps you will reply, 'I gave him good advice' [i.e. it was *really* to his interest to sell his field and get the donkey]. [No, even so, you must not act thus.] This is a matter delivered to the heart." (*Sifra, Kedhoshim*, II, § 14, f. 88d.)

Dr Montefiore's comment is:

"There is no actual law against such action, but good feeling and the higher justice declare that it must not be done. It may

In order to understand Jesuit casuistry, a short historical survey is necessary.

By the seventh century, the Discipline of Penance, which had existed in inchoate form from the very earliest times, was erected into something like a system. The act of penitence comprised three moments, the *conversio mentis*, *confessio oris*, and *vindicta peccati* (subsequently *contritio cordis*, *confessio oris*, and *satisfactio operis*). Leaving aside 1 and 3, it may be said that the *confessio oris* in the early Middle Ages could be made, at the discretion of the penitent, either directly to God, or to the priest.* Confession to the priest had a special advantage, for in the words of the Council of Châlons (A.D. 813) "it shows how sins are purged". To discover how, and to assess the penalty, the priest had already a goodly array of penitential books, especially of Celtic origin, which had an immense vogue in Frankish lands. It should be noted that the same Council of Châlons ordered a holocaust of them. These were necessarily tentative and incomplete, and a great deal was left to the learning or ingenuity of the individual confessor.

With the growth of scholastic theology, penance was promoted to the dignity of a sacrament (Council of therefore be readily imagined that hypocrisy is one of the sins most strongly condemned."

Abrahams has a splendid essay on this theme entitled "Rabbinic delicacies". It will be found in his *Studies in Pharisaism*, vol. II.

(4) A man must not be *Gonebh Da'ath*, lit. "stealing the mind", i.e. circumventing his neighbour so as to create a false impression, cf. *T.B. Hullin* 94a (Germ. trs. G. viii, 1109) and examples cited on p. 318*.

For other references see *T.B. Shebu'oth* 39a (Germ. trs. G. vii, 750); *Bab.M.* iv, 12 (Eng. trs. D. p. 355).]

* A Jesuit friend of mine tells me that he considers that at so late a date as the early Middle Ages it was hardly open to controversy that confession must be made to God *through* a priest.

Lyons, A.D. 1274); but the most important step in its development had been made already in 1215 by the Lateran Council which laid upon all baptized persons the obligation of confession to an authorized priest at Easter. This obligation gave to Christian casuistry its charter. The confessor is at once a physician, healing the wounded conscience, and a judge, discriminating between mortal and venial sin. Dante,¹⁶ writing when the order had been in force for about 80 years, speaks of the two keys, one of silver which discerns the true penitent, the other of gold, being the power of absolution, and it is the former which requires most art and wit. As judge, the confessor must have a body of precedent, fuller and more satisfying than the rather promiscuous Penitentials. So the thirteenth and following centuries saw the growth of handbooks, *Summae*, e.g. *Summa de Casibus*, 1235, *Summa conscientiae*, 1534, the ancestors of the Jesuit books which kindled Pascal's indignation. Now, with compulsory confession, involving an official decision on every kind of doubtful case, a system of determining such cases is imperative. The priest, according to the Council which obliged him to hear and absolve, was required to deal diligently with the different circumstances. Thus the law against theft cannot in equity be applied with equal stringency to the case of an avaricious millionaire and to that of a starving beggar. But if you admit that the general law allows of different application, it is important that the modifications should be honestly applied, to solve honest doubt, to clear a doubting conscience. Hence comes Probabilism. The confessor does not know whether the sin referred to him is really forbidden or not; there may be a law restricting freedom in this

particular case; but he is not aware of it. He turns up his *Summae*, and he finds that there is a difference of opinion among the learned—the doctors disagree. According to some, there is a restricting law; according to others, there is not. Both opinions are probable, plausible; each has something to be said for it. If he refuses to take any risk; if he follows the opinion which says there is a law, he is a Tutorist, following the safer opinion. If he chooses the less safe opinion, even when it has less to be said for it than the other, he is a Probabilist. There are other shades, Probabiliorism, Equiprobabilism (which is Alfonso Liguori's opinion, and holds to-day). He must be sure that the risky, the less probable, opinion has really something to be said for it, and said by weighty authority. To catch at any *obiter dictum* just because it lets the sinner off, gives him an excuse for following his bent, is an extreme of Probabilism which has and deserves the stigma of Laxity.

Probabilism was definitely propounded in 1577 by a Benedictine, Bartolomé de Medina, in the following terms: "If an opinion is probable, it may be followed, although the opposite opinion be more probable: a probable opinion is one which we can follow without risk of sin."¹⁷

Probabilism, then, is not an application of the rule that probability is the guide of life. The moral rules are certain, but the application is not. You must take the circumstance of each case into consideration; and, if you have a recognized authority—not necessarily the majority of authorities—you will be saved from arbitrary attempts to dodge the rule, and likely to find a *bona fide* solution. The problem is not to find the

most probable general interpretation, but the one which best fits the particular case, and it is possible that there may be some exceptional interpretation which will hold.

Confessors, bewildered by the multiplicity and variety of the cases proposed to them (and “c'est un sujet merveilleusement ondoyant que l'homme”) welcomed Medina's proposition, and by 1600 it was rooted in the practice of the majority. Voices were raised against it, notably by distinguished Jesuits, Molina, Bellarmine, Vitelleschi, but the bulk of the Society of Jesus, the great confessors, adopted it, and often strained it, as we learn from Pascal's invective.

And here I would enter a *caveat* against a view of Probabilism which was shared by the lamented Israel Abrahams among others, that Probabilism means surrender of the right of private judgement. “The Talmud avoided the pitfall of probabilism into which Jesuitical casuistry fell...the Talmud never disputed the individual's autonomy.”¹⁸ As a fact, Probabilism is a curious rebound from the extreme opposition to private judgement. It was said that it is not safe to follow private judgement because that will not give security—we must follow authority which, it is assumed, will. This was extended from judgement of doctrine to matters of conscience. But in these last, at least, the question could not be escaped. What if there is no certainty? Then still follow authority, but follow the best. But if these differ among themselves? How are we *here* to tell the best? Probabilism evaded the issue. Instead of saying, “Judge for yourself of the reason of the thing”, it said “Choose which you please of these authorities”. This is to let in private judgement without

its responsibilities; and it may be argued that, in the last resort, the Jesuits could not exclude private judgement any more than could the Jews. But it is true that the Jews did not have to face the same practical difficulty as the Christians, who were bound by the Lateran Council to pronounce on all possible cases, with results of infinite importance to the penitentiary.

Let us see whether there are any points of contact between the two systems. One would expect such when we hear of *Kawwanah* = inward intention* and

* [This desire for inwardness operated in many ways. Thus "Ye shall not oppress (*Tonu*) one another" (Lev. xxv, 14). What is '*ona'ah* (oppression, vexation)? This is a fine point in ethics. Wrongdoing is not confined to deeds, it includes thought and speech. You must not say "I will not lend you my spade because, yesterday, you would not lend me your hoe." Nor may you say, "Certainly I will lend you my spade, just to show that I am not like you." You must not look into a shop window and raise the shopkeeper's hopes, when you have no intention of buying anything. (Cf. p. 313. This would rule out "demonstration rides" in cars!) Nor is it right to tell a guest that you have opened a bottle of wine specially for him, when you had intended doing so for yourself, in any case. And you must not invite a guest when you know, beforehand, that he cannot accept. All this is '*ona'ah*. See an interesting passage in *Tanh.*, vay-Yera, § 14, f. 36b (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 134). See also *Šifra*, *Behar*, *Perek* III, para. 4, § 4, f. 107c, and ib., *Perek* IV, § 1, f. 107d. '*Ona'ah* in words is worse than in deeds, *T.B. Bab. M.* 58b (Germ. trs. *G. vi*, 675). See *Addendum*, p. 331.

R. Abbahu said: "There are three classes of sinners in whose face the veil of heaven [*paragauda*] is never closed; those guilty of '*ona'ah*, of theft, and of idolatry": this means that God and His ministering angels are always on the watch to check these sins and punish the sinners. *Tanh.*, Noah, § 4, f. 17a (Germ. trs. *Sin.* p. 46); also *T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 59a (Germ. trs. *G. vi*, 677 foot).

Then there is the term *Gonebh Da'ath* (stealing the mind): this means deceit or circumvention and may be derived from "stealing the heart" in Gen. xxxi, 20, 26. Thus, "It is forbidden to 'steal the mind of any fellow-creature, not even of a Gentile'" (*T.B. Hullin* 94a) (Germ. trs. *G. viii*, 1108). Moreover theft from a Gentile is worse than theft from a Jew because it also involves the

Lishmah =for its own sake, i.e. with sincerity on the one hand, and purification of intention on the other.

profanation of the Divine Name (*Tos. Bab.K.* x, 15 (*Z.* 368 top)).

There is also *Shurath had-Din*, "the line of the Law" or, as we should say, the letter of the Law. On this see *Mech.*¹ f. 67b, on Exod. xviii, 20 (Eng. trs. *L.* II, 182) and *R.T.* pp. 191 and 282.

The principle of *Lishmah* may be illustrated by the following:

"R. Dosithei b. R. Yannai [Jannaeus] said: 'Why did God not create warm springs in Jerusalem as He has done in Tiberias? So that one Israelite should not say to another, "Let us go up to Jerusalem. If we go up just only for one warm bath, it will be enough." Then there would be a going-up which would not be for its own sake' [*Lishmah*]'" (*Sifre Num.* 25a).

As regards *Kawanah*, I venture to cite from the forthcoming Rabbinic Anthology, in which Dr Montefiore has accorded me the *Zekhuth* of collaboration:

"R. Me'ir said: 'All depends upon the Kawwanah of the heart'" (cf. *R.T.* p. 187) (*T.B. Meg.* 20a (Germ. trs. *G.* III, 619)).

The predominant view of the Rabbis, as against Raba's remark in *T.B. R.H.* 28b (Germ. trs. *G.* III, 374) (see also *T.B. Ber.* 13a (Eng. trs. *C.* p. 83)) is that intention is certainly necessary. The question is not altogether like that of *ex opere operato* or *operantis*. For example, in the case of the *Shema'*, the existence of devotion on the part of the individual is not challenged; it is assumed. The man under consideration chances to be studying the Bible, and happens actually to be at Deut. iv, when the time for the *Shema'* has arrived. He reads the passage with devotion, but the problem arises, has he read the passage, for edification, as a pious act, or has he thereby fulfilled his legal obligation to recite the *Shema'*? Is his devotion tantamount to intention? Or is the technical difference between intention and edification negligible? A somewhat similar instance, in connexion with the blowing of the *Shofar*, is discussed in *R.H.* 28b (Germ. trs. *cit. sup.*). But so far as attuning the mind is concerned, the Rabbis were emphatic in regarding this as essential. Hence the institution of *Kawwanoth*, or meditations introduced before the performance of a sacred duty or the recitation of a prayer, so as to attune the mind of the agent or worshipper. These *Kawwanoth* sometimes precede the prayer or act, and begin, "Behold, I am intent on . . ." (see *P.B.S.* pp. 14, 15, 218), and sometimes are interwoven in the body of the prayers or in the margins, in small type. Most of these *Kawwanoth* are in origin Kabbalistic, but for an earlier statement on *Kawwanah* see

What did the Pharisees mean by *Kawwanah* and *Lishmah*?* It was a common Rabbinic adage that the fulfilment of the Torah required *Kawwanah*: no religious deed was valid if performed mechanically or perfunctorily, or if it was performed incidentally while doing something else. Every act had to be carried out in obedience to the divine command, and with the full cognisance that that was the reason for which it was being carried out. In order to preserve the conscience from mere mechanism, or when it is tempted to act cleverly, e.g. to evade the spirit of Torah expressed in one enactment by means of the letter of another enactment, the Pharisees generally required that the Jew engaged upon the performance of a command must do it with *Kawwanah*, i.e. with attention and true intention.

Here is room for casuistry. Has a man fulfilled his obligation if he has executed the command but not with *Kawwanah*? One Rabbi said in certain cases *Kawwanah* was not necessary, but the majority said it was necessary. "All depends on the intention of the heart." This especially applied to prayer. "One who says the *Tefillah* must direct his heart to each benediction; if unable to do so to each one, he must at least direct it to one." "He whose mind is not calm should not pray."¹⁹

Maimonides, *Yad, Hilchoth Tefillah*, iv, 15 sqq.: "No prayer without *Kawwanah* is a prayer...if a man's mind is disturbed he should first compose himself, and then pray: one who is back from a journey and tired should not pray...."

* Reference should be made to the late Dr H. G. Enelow's *Kawvana: the struggle for inwardness in Judaism*, in the *K. Kohler Memorial Volume*, Berlin, 1913; since reprinted on pp. 252 sqq. of vol. iv of *Selected Works of Hyman G. Enelow*, privately printed (Kingsport Press, Kingsport, Tenn. U.S.A.), 1935. Also *J.Q.R.* (N.S.), v, 498 sqq.

One is reminded of the king in *Hamlet*, "Words without thoughts never to heaven go."

In a word, motive is the test of action.

The Jesuits, too, laid stress on purity of motive. They denied absolution to a man who sinned with the intention of sinning,* but they suggested that the will, contemplating an action, might safely substitute for the real, bad, intention a harmless one. Pascal, who deals with this in his *Seventh Letter*, saw and proclaimed that there can be only one intention in any act, and that to substitute another for it is only self-deceit, and that absolution obtained for a wrong act, when such substitution has been made, is obtained under false pretences.

So, really, the likeness between *Lishmah* and the direction of the intention is purely verbal.

There is, however, substantial likeness in the matter of usury; but I consider it in the highest degree improbable that there was conscious borrowing on either side. A common source for the moral obligation, viz. Holy Scripture (though to the Old Testament text Christian canonists added a misinterpretation of Luke vi, 35),²⁰ a common motive, for, to quote Adam Smith, "As something can everywhere be made by the use of money, something ought everywhere to be paid for the use of it",²¹ such is the origin of the law against usury, and the attempts to evade it. And, men being what they are, similarity is not surprising.

The Mosaic law concerning usury was simple and definite. "Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of

* For this, cf. *T.B. Yoma* 87a (Germ. trs. G. II, 1027): "If a man says 'I will sin and then repent', God does not pardon."

anything that is lent upon usury; unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury, that the Lord God may bless thee", etc. (Deut. xxiii, 19, 20; cf. Exod. xxii, 25). It must, however, be noted that this attitude, that of the Elohist, differs from the *H.* and *P.* documents; thus, in Lev. xxv, 35-37, no usury may be taken from a sojourner.²² In the first passage quoted we have a ban upon taking interest from Jews, but a blessing, or, to say the least, an encouragement to take it from Gentiles. The underlying motive is charitable: the notion being that the borrower is in need, and that it would be simple oppression to take advantage of his need.*

Upon this two remarks are relevant. The Talmud,²³ commenting on the description of the righteous man in Ps. xv, 5, says "His money he putteth not on usury", i.e. he does not lend even at legitimate interest either to Jew or Gentile."

On the other hand, it is frequently stated that it is better to lend to a poor man than to make him a gift,

* [On this question, see Driver's excellent note on Exod. xxii, 25, in his ed. of Exodus in the *Cambridge Bible*. The prohibition of usury applied to charity and the permission of usury to commerce, which was, until a late period, in the hands of Gentiles, Phoenicians, Mesopotamians, etc. The Israelites were an agricultural people. The word for merchant is "Canaanite" (cf. Prov. xxxi, 24; Zech. xiv, 21). Prov. xxviii, 8 and Ps. xv, 5 are evidence of the ideal for the true Israelite. "His money he hath not put out to usury" is held, for such a man, to apply "even to a Gentile" in *T.B. Makkoth* 24a (Germ. trs. G. vii, 607): see also *T.B. Bab. Meṣ.* 71a (Germ. trs. G. vi, 721).]

See *Excursus* on usury in *S.C.B.M.*, cit. *infra*. On direct interest (*Kesuṣah*) to Gentiles, see Maimonides, *Yad, Hilkhoth Malweh we-Loweh*, ch. v, §§ 1 sqq. Business associations with Gentiles lead to idolatry.]

for so you maintain his self-respect. In this connexion no mention of interest is ever made.

The explanation of the law by the Mishnah²⁴ is also definite and simple. "What is usury (*neshakh*=biting) and what is increase (*tarbith*=product), both equally forbidden, *tarbith* being rabbinical extension of the scriptural anti-usury law? It is usury when a man lends 4 denars for 5, or 2 seahs of wheat for 3." So much for *neshakh*. *Tarbith* is illustrated thus. I buy of you wheat at 25 denars the *Kor* (market price) and pay cash, leaving the wheat with you. Wheat rises to 30 denars the *Kor*, and I claim delivery of the wheat which I want to sell and with the produce of which I want to buy wine. You offer to buy it back at 30 denars and give me wine at its market price, although you have no wine at the time. This is *tarbith*, for meanwhile, before the bargain is consummated, wine may rise in price, and I shall get more than my due.

The same Mishnah²⁵ distinguishes between usury paid in advance and usury paid afterwards, so says Rabban Gamaliel of the early second century. Thus if a man borrowed from another, and made him a present, and said "that thou mayest lend me money" this is usury paid in advance. (The Rabbis will have no gambling in futures.) If a man borrowed from another and repaid to him and then sent him a present saying "this is for thy money of which thou hadst no use while it was with me" this is usury that is paid afterwards. Rabbi Simeon said "There may be usury paid in words: a man may not say to his creditor 'know thou that such a man has come from such a place', i.e. giving valuable information in consideration of a loan. These three transgress a negative command, the lender,

the borrower and the witnesses, and, so the Sages say, the scrivener also. They all transgress the command ‘thou shalt not give thy money upon usury’.”

Other transactions condemned as usurious or tending to usury are: Partnership with an impecunious partner (because of possible loss of time and labour as well as the risk of money loss); or with a shopkeeper to sell at retail on half profits of the wholesale price (because of the risk of loss by fire, flood, or fall in value) unless you pay him wages for selling. But the wage may be merely nominal: the award of a single dried fig is sufficient consideration to give exemption from the usury law.

Interest on deferred payment is forbidden, but mortgage, as we understand it, where the property remains with the debtor but passes immediately to the creditor when the bond is not fulfilled—this is allowed. As a fact, mortgage was known as the Jewish gage when, for the first time, mortgage was introduced into English law at the end of the twelfth century;²⁶ it disappeared when the Jews were driven out and did not reappear till the fifteenth century.²⁷

As the Middle Ages advanced, further alleviations of the strict rules came in. For instance, this case arises. *A* says to *B*, “Lend me 100 *zuzim*.” *B* replies, “I have no money but I have wheat worth that.” Then *B* buys back the wheat (which has not changed hands) for 90 *zuzim*, and he may legally recover 100 *zuzim*, and, says Maimonides, “it is not even ‘dust’ (*abak*=suspicion, pretence) of increase; such dust as is involved in the giving of a present in recognition of a loan, to which I have already referred.”* But

* [*Yad, Hilkhoth Malweh we-Loweh*, ch. v, § 15.]

Maimonides says that such transactions belong to the class of things which are "legally permissible but (morally) forbidden as subtle circumventions of the usury law."*

The intervention of a Gentile† might lead to evasion of the law between contracting Jews. *A*, not needing money himself, borrows from *B*, a Gentile, and lends it to *C*, a Jew, who is to pay interest thereon. This may be done only with the consent of *B*, but not on *A*'s sole responsibility, although he has to pay *B* the interest given by *C*. Another case: *A* lends to *B*, a Gentile. *B* ceases to need the loan, but meets *C*, a Jew, who does need it. If *B* is willing to lend to *C* on interest, he may do so, remaining bound to *A*; but *A* must not be partner to the change of debtor.

Such modifications or alleviations, or practical applications, were rendered necessary by the fact that Jews no longer lived on farms in Palestine or Babylonia but were compelled to trade in money. "There are things like interest which are allowed", e.g. a man may buy at discount bonds belonging to a neighbour, a man may give his neighbour a *denar* on condition that he lends 100 *denars* to a third party, and so on.

Now I turn to the Jesuits, or rather to the devices which grew up in the course of the Middle Ages, to which the Society of Jesus gave its blessing, and which Pascal withered by his scorn.

It must be noted that the Church was even stricter than the Jews in condemning usury. The motive was

* [*Ha'aramath Ribbith*, from the same root as '*Ormah* (above, p. 312): such evasions are condemned, and the phrase is used, in *T.B. Bab. Meṣ. 62b* (Germ. trs. G. vi, 693).]

† This contingency is dealt with in *S.C.B.M.* II, 284, note 1263*u* (5).

the right and proper hatred of covetousness: the justification was the text of Scripture—not only the Old Testament, but also St Luke vi, 35, according to the Vulgate, *Mutuum date, nihil inde sperantes*. This is a mistranslation of the Greek δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες, which means, “Lend, causing no one to despair”, or “not despairing yourself”, “without anxiety”.²⁸

Fortified by this, and by Aristotle’s wrong-headed remark* that money is barren,²⁹ the Canonists declared that any return upon a loan is contrary to divine law. It was usury, and usury was the deadliest of deadly sins. The Jews, dogs and, *ipso facto*, excommunicate, might practise it, but a Christian must keep from the accursed thing at peril of his soul. But money is the sinews of war and of commerce, and strict obedience to the canon would have meant general paralysis. Belligerent kings turned to the Jews, used them as we know, and found them so useful that they tried to prevent their conversion to Christianity, and actually claimed compensation when that happened. Merchants, seeing the trade of Western Europe passing into the hands of Jewry, tried to clutch a piece of it before it passed out of their grasp, and invented various evasions. The Papacy connived at the malpractice of the Lombard bankers and the Cahorsini to whom Dante gives a place of unenviable distinction in Hell. They were known as the merchants and exchangers of our Lord the Pope,

* The learned Jesuit authority quoted above remarks that “Aristotle’s dictum is still a fundamental principle of the Roman Church”. The Church with great courage and sincerity grappled with the difficulty of reconciling the old views of usury to new conditions. Nor was it blind to the existence of malpractices in certain quarters, e.g. the views of such devout and convincing authorities as Dante and Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln.

and their methods were not pretty. "They force a man," said the dying Grosseteste, "who borrows 100 marks from them, promising to pay 100 pounds for them at the end of the year, to sign an acknowledgement that he has received 100 pounds: and they are harder than the Jews, for if, after a short time, the borrower offers to repay, they will not take less than 100 pounds, while the Jews could ask only for the interest on 100 marks for the time the borrower has actually kept the money."³⁰ It is worth noticing that the original of Shylock was not a Jew, but a Gentile banker.³¹

Coming to the Jesuits and the *Provincial Letters* we find Fathers Bauny and Escobar deliberately advocating methods of securing interest without incurring the punishments due to usurers whom Bauny admits to be "infamous when alive and unworthy of Christian burial when dead". These methods are the *trinus contractus* and *Mohatra*. The *trinus contractus* or triple contract seems to have originated as long ago as the eleventh century but it was brought into vogue by Navarrus, the Spanish Austin friar of the sixteenth century, and adopted by Jesuit confessors. It was this: I enter into partnership with you and both of us expect a profit of, say, 80 per cent (first contract). Then I insure my capital by relinquishing to you 10 per cent of my expected profit (second contract). Then I insure the rest of my expectation by relinquishing a further 10 per cent (third contract), and I am left with an immediate profit of 10 per cent.

Mohatra. This is a Spanish word* meaning risk.

* [Probably the word is ultimately derived from the Arabic, which means to *hazard* or *bet*. See Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, Bk. I, Part II, pp. 764-5: *Muḥāṭir* is "one who contends"; the verb

In modern Spanish *Mohatrar* =to make a deceitful sale, and *mohatrero* is an extortioner. So, as a word, it has a doubtful ring.

I need cash and can pay for it. But this is forbidden by the Church, so I combine with you to dodge the Church.

I sell to you for £110, to be repaid within a year, goods which you at once sell back for £100. You get 10 per cent and I get the cash I need. No goods pass between us.

This buying and selling of goods which are never delivered (which is advocated by Escobar) was condemned as usury by Innocent XI in 1679 after the Jansenists had exposed it.

Now all these manipulations and manœuvres are innocent enough in themselves; indeed, it is difficult for the modern man, always seeking for a safe investment and as high a return as he can get, to see what is wrong in any of them. They are not fraudulent. The harm lies not in the devices themselves but in the underlying motive of evading the law which the inventor pretends to honour and obey.

The cure lay in a reform of the Canon law, with its rigid regulations. We heard a fortnight ago from Rabbi Rabinowitz of the activity of Rabbinical synods in North France, adjusting previous law to changed circumstances. The same thing was already happening in local Church councils, and the Rabbi pointed to it as an example of the influence of Christianity upon Judaism.

means "to enter in a wager". Dozy, in his *Supplément aux Dictionnaires Arabes*, p. 383, gives the full phrase as "bi'a *Mohatarah*" with the following meaning: "Vente où l'on court des risques (*mohatra*), contrat, marché, par lequel un marchand vend très-cher à crédit ce qu'il rachète aussitôt à très-vil prix."]

Pressed by the rising tide of commercial freedom, the Canonists tried to make gaps in the fence, and we hear the terms *damnum emergens*, *lucrum cessans*, *periculum sortis*, etc. But for good or ill—good in so far as the Church was seeking to protect the poor from oppression, bad in so far as restriction encouraged evasion—the strict rules lived on, and prohibition of usury and interest remained unrepealed in France, at least until the revolution of 1789 swept them away. One reason, no doubt, was the *malum exemplum* of Protestantism which had cast off the fetters of Canon law and scholasticism and left the question to be settled by the individual conscience and casuistry of the simple sort, from which we started out.

This last lecture of the course arranged by Mr Loewe has tried to deal very superficially, I fear, with a rather special point of contact between Pharisaism and one other system of thought and practice. I feel that we ought not to separate without a word being said on the general result of the series, as it appears to me. I may say that five of the six lectures have been followed by one of their hearers with absorbed interest. I feel that new horizons have opened up, new contacts been established, and food for much thought and reflection afforded. It would be impertinent and idle of me to attempt to summarize these lectures, but if I were asked to express the impression created in my own mind by this combined study of Judaism in relation to other religions, and especially in relation to Christianity, I should like to borrow some words of Pascal.

Pascal has harsh things to say about what he calls the carnal Jews whose eyes were set upon the earth

and upon a great temporal prince as Messiah. But he has equally harsh, and harsher, things to say of the carnal Christians, i.e. the Jesuits, whose object, in his eyes, is to dispense mankind from the obligation to love God. But of the true Jews and the true Christians he says that they have one and the same religion. "La religion des Juifs semblait consister essentiellement en la paternité d'Abraham, en la circoncision, aux sacrifices, aux cérémonies, en l'arche, au temple, en Hiérusalem, et, enfin en la loi et en l'alliance de Moïse. Je dis: qu'elle ne consistait en aucune de ces choses, mais seulement en l'amour de Dieu."³²

And I think we may be content to leave it at that.

NOTES

TO CHAPTER VIII

¹ *H.L.* pp. 413, 540.

² E. R. Bernard, *The Path to Freedom*, Nisbet, 1894, p. 19.

³ *T.B. Bab.K.* 79b (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 287), and *T.B. Bab.B.* 60b (Germ. trs. *G.* vi, 1102); *T.B. Hor.* 3b (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 1060) and *'Ab. Zar.* 36a (Germ. trs. *G.* vii, 918). See also *Jud.* ii, 263.

⁴ *Oraison funèbre de Nicolas Cornet.*

⁵ See *Ma'aser Sheni*, iv, §4 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 79).

⁶ Ib. iv, § 5 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 79).

⁷ *Shab.* xvii, §3 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 114).

⁸ *Temurah* v, §1 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 559).

⁹ *Nazir* ii, §5 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 282).

¹⁰ *Ancient Law*, ch. 2.

¹¹ Cf. *J.L.* pp. 126, 127.

¹² 'Erubin vii, §§ 6 sqq. (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 131).

¹³ *Shab.* i, §§ 1 sqq. (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 100).

¹⁴ For the formula see *P.B.G.* ii (New Year) 24.

¹⁵ Cf. *S.C.B.M.* ii, p. cxii. See also *Shebi'ith* x, §4 (Eng. trs. *D.* p. 51).

¹⁶ *Purg.* ix, 118f.

¹⁷ B. de Medina, *Expositio Summae II^a II^{ae}.*

- ¹⁸ *Some Permanent Values in Judaism*, p. 814, Oxford, 1924.
- ¹⁹ *Ber.* II, § 1 (Eng. trs. D. p. 3); ib. III, § 1 (Eng. trs. D. p. 5).
- ²⁰ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. cii.
- ²¹ *Wealth of Nations*, Bk. II, ch. 4 *ad fin.*
- ²² *S.C.B.M.* II, p. c.
- ²³ *T.B. Makkoth* 24a (Germ. trs. G. VII, 607).
- ²⁴ *Bab.M.* v, § 1 (Eng. trs. D. p. 355).
- ²⁵ *Bab.M.* v, § 10 (Eng. trs. D. p. 357).
- ²⁶ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. lxiii.
- ²⁷ See F. Ashe Lincoln's essay in *S.C.B.M.* II.
- ²⁸ *S.C.B.M.* II, p. cii.
- ²⁹ *Pol.* I, 10. 5.
- ³⁰ *S.C.B.M.* II, notes h, i, pp. cv and cvi.
- ³¹ *S.C.B.M.* II, 271, note 126 (g).
- ³² *Pensées*, no. 610, ed. Brunschvicg.

ADDENDUM

P. 318. [The suggestion that the principle of 'onā'ah in Jewish law influenced—possibly was the origin of—*lesio enormis* in Roman law, is discussed and criticized by Prof. H. F. Jolowicz (against the arguments of Dickstein and others) in *The Juridical Review*, March 1937, pp. 50 sqq.]

INDEX

A. GENERAL

- Aaron**, in the *Kur'an*, 157; Philo and Josephus on his robes, 79f.
- Aaron of Lincoln**, financier of abbeys, 247*
- Ab**, ninth of, 31*
- Abba had-Doresh*, 11
- Abbahu (R.)** on the three classes of sinners, 318*
- Abbahu (R.) of Caesarea**, 144n.
- Abdallah ibn Salam**, Rabbi of Khaibar, identified with Nicodemus, 153*
- Abel**, story of, in Islam, 159
- '*Abhodhah Zarah*, difference in attitude to Gentiles between Mishnah and Tosefta, 42
- Ablutions**, in Islam, 165
- Aboth*, miracles in, 23; tradition in, compared with Muslim, 170
- Abraham**, 40; in the *Kur'an*, 151, 158f.; story of, in Islam, 159
- Abraham de Balmes**, taught Hebrew to Italian Christians, 277*
- Abraham ibn Ezra**, biblical criticism of, 241; commentaries of, available to Christianscholars, 279
- Abraham of Beja**, 262
- Abraham Saba**, on book burnings, 264
- Abrahams, I.**, cited, 57n., 220n., 251n.; on anti-Semitism, 258; on the Decalogue, 87*; on the '*Iggereth Musar* of Moses Nachmanides, 228; on Jewish monogamy, 207f.; on *Kawwanah* and *Lishmah*, 312*; on Kimhi and the A.V., 12; on legal fiction, 309; on "The Nine Worthies," 41; on Probabilism, 317; on R. Joshua and miracles, 22*; *Studies in Pharisaism*, 4; see also H.E.W. and J.L.
- Abrahams, M.**, on fragment of a liturgy from Bury St Edmunds, 198*
- Acta Sanctorum*, O.T. heroes in, 127†
- Action**, categories of, in Islam and Judaism, 177
- Adam**, 40; fall of, in Philo, 76f.; story of, in Islam, 159
- '*Adân*, the second corresponds to Jewish invitation to prayer, 166
- Adoptionism**, place of Servetus in, 257
- Adultery**, Muslim laws on, 178
- Aegidio**, Cardinal of Viterbo, see Egidio
- Aeschylus**, 77*
- Aethelbert**, his *Doom* compared with enactment of R. Tam, 207
- Agde**, *Canon* 12, 144n.
- Aggadah**, see *Haggadah*
- Ahikar*, story in Elephantine papyri, 245†
- '*Ahizath 'eynayim*, 178†, 179
- '*Ahl al-kitab*, 152, 168
- Ahmad**, in the *Kur'an*, 13*
- Ahrens, W.**, 185n.
- αἰώνιος*, meaning of, 28*
- Akh* and *Rak*, 11
- Akiba**, and Bar Kochba, 38; and Ecclesiastes and Canticles, 31*; the Exodus a type of future deliverance, 83f.; on Lev. xxv 35–6, 307*; school of, 11
- A.L.*, 251n.; on Jewish slavery, 51†; on the Talmud, 210*

- Alamoth**, 44*
- Al-Bam**, 57 addendum
- Albeck**, Ch., on Jubilees, 48‡, 127*
- Albertus Magnus**, system based on Maimonides, 204
- Album**, derivation of word, 13f.
- Alcibiades**, 19
- '*Alenu, Hebbel* used for idols in, 111 addendum
- Alexander Balas**, 48§
- Alexander III**, opposed to confiscation of possessions of Jewish converts, 251
- Alexander of Hales**, and works of Jewish philosophers, 204
- Alexandra Salome**, Queen, Pharisees under, 180
- Alexandria**, Christianity of, 104; philosophy of, 63
- Alexandrine Judaism**, influence on Rabbinic Judaism, 74ff.
- Alfonso Liguori (St)**, and casuistry, 300; on Probabiliorism, etc., 316
- Allah**, characteristics of, borrowed from Judaism and Christianity, 154
- Allegory**, use of, by Stoics, 70f.; use of, by Jewish apologists, 70ff.; Philo's use of, 77f.; used by Christians to interpret the Law, 126
- Almemar**, in Ashkenazic Judaism, 163*
- al-Rahman=Rahmana* of the Talmud, 165
- Ambrose**, on Jewish-Christian heretics, 138*.
- American constitutions**, modelled on supposed Hebrew lines, 271
- '*Am ha-'areg*', 46f.
- 'Amidah**, derivation of, 165, 165*; in Eccl., 25†; tests for heretics in, 42†; associated with the Exodus (*Ge'ullah*), 84†; on the keeping of the Sabbath by the Patriarchs, 127*; *Kiydm* Arabic equivalent to, 165; metaphor of begging in introductory hymn, 244†
- '*Amorāim*, parallel to the *Mukallids*, 173
- Amos**, 40
- Amsterdam**, charity at, 46; Synagogue of, 266
- Andrae**, Tor, 185n.
- Angels**, appear as *δαιμόνια* in Philo, 77; forces of nature as, 33f.; in Pharisaism, 32ff.; planets as rebel, 97; Sabbath, 34f.
- Animals**, kindness to, 49
- '*Ani wa-hu*', 83*
- Annas**, High Priest, 81
- Anthropomorphic deities**, 24
- Antichrist**, defeat of, 38
- Antigonus of Sokho**, condemns Eudaimonism, 53; on Eudaimonism, 27
- Antioch**, Canon I, 144n.
- Antiochus Epiphanes**, not a representative Greek, 51*
- Anti-semitism**, in Luther, 260; in Middle Ages, 258
- Antoninus**, 41*; as a *Ger Sedek*, 43*
- Apocalypse**, and Pharisaism, 30f.
- Apocalypses**, excluded from Canon, 15f.
- Apocalyptic literature**, parallels to, in the *Kur'an*, 155
- Apocalyptic writings**, canonicity of, 31
- Apocrypha**, Alexandrine, canonicity of, 31; in English Bible, 31*; survival of, 10
- Apocryphal literature**, parallels to, in the *Kur'an*, 155
- Apollo of Claros**, on Iao, 104
- Apostasy**, danger of, in Alexandrine Judaism, 72
- Aptowitz**, cited, 184n.

- Apuleius**, on deliverance, 100; *Metam.* xi, 15, 783, 111 n.
- Aquila**, version of, 11
- Aquinas, Thomas**, influenced by Maimonides, 204; on intercourse with Jews, 199; on the interpretation of Scripture, 239 f.; on the salvation of those who doubt the Incarnation, 230
- Arabia**, influence on the Bible, 158 ‡
- Arabs**, political and social contact between Jews and, 150
- Archons**, planets and stars as, 96 f.
- Arians**, Jewish tendency of, 138
- Aristotle**, his remark on the barrenness of money, used by the Church, 326
- Ars Magna* of Raymond Lully founded on Cabbala, 205
- Artabanus**, on Moses, 93
- Artemis**, 19, 19*
- Article VII**, Thomas Rogers on, 279
- Artimidorus**, 83 †
- Asceticism**, 48
- Asclepius**, the Hermetic view of sacrifice in, 81*
- 'Ashab**, 172
- Asher b. Yehiel** (Rosh), on humility, 228; and the Tosafists, 218
- Ashkenazi Jewry**, influences on, 209
- 'Ashura**, fast of, adopted by Muhammad, 160 f.; similarity to the Day of Atonement, 161; term used by Arabian Jews for Day of Atonement, 165
- Assumption of Moses**, *At-Bash* in, 14
- Astarte**, elements from, in conception of Wisdom in Ecclesiasticus, 67
- Astrology**, in Enoch, 95; invented by Abraham, 93; in Judaism, 95 ff.; in Paul, 99 ff.; in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, 88 f.; in Philo, 95 f.; in the Talmud, 99*; technical terms used by Pal, 100*; in *Tosefta*, 101
- At-Bah*, 14*
- At-Bash*, 13
- Athanasius and Zacchaeus, Dialogue of*, 144 n.
- 'Athidh Labho*, 37*
- Atonement**, witness of the Zohar to the, 293; Day of, compared with *'Ashura*, 161, 165
- Augustine**, on Jewish Christian heretics, 138*
- Augustus, Philip**, 216
- Aulis**, 19*
- Aulus Gellius**, *Noctes Atticae*, 74*
- Authorized Version**, dependent on Tyndale, 201 f.; Hebraists among translators of, 278; influence of Kimhi on, 12
- Avicebron**, *see Solomon ibn Gabiro*
- Avigdor Kara**, songs composed by, used by Hussites, 265
- Azariah (R.)**, on God's use of *'Ormah*, 312*
- Babylonia**, Jews' attachment to, 42; Jews in, under Arab rule, 167; Gaonic development of Mishnah in, 246
- Bacher, W.**, on the Halakhah, 169 †
- Bacon, Francis**, *Certaine Psalms written in Sickness*, 288*
- Bacon, Roger**, debt of the Reformation to the school of, 274; on the study of Hebrew, 194; Hebrew Grammar of, 198*, 274*; pupil of author of *Correctorium Vaticanicum*, 193
- Baeck, L.**, on "The Third Generation", 124*
- Balmes, Abraham de**, 277*
- Banking**, Jews forced into, 247

- Banu Israil** in Muslim tradition, 153f.
- Barbohin**, 49*
- Bar Kochba**, and Akiba, 38
- Barnabas**, Epistle of, interpretation of the Law, 126
- Barrow**, on Judaizing sects, 1590, 280*
- Bartolomé de Medina**, definition of Probabilism (*Expositio Summae*), 316, 330n.
- Baruch**, Book of, liturgical use of, 31*
- Baruch II**, pessimism in, 98
- Barukh (R.)** of Medziboz, on miracles, 20†
- Bath Kol**, Christian parallels to, 20†; importance of, 22f.
- Bauny**, casuistry applied to usury by, 327
- Beast**, mark of, in Revelation, 14
- Becker, C. H.**, 150, 184n.; on relation between Christian and Muslim prayer, 162ff.
- Bédarride, I.**, on the burnings of the Talmud, 301*
- Begging**, in Middle Ages among Jews, 244f.
- Beladuri**, on witchcraft, 178f.
- Bellarmino**, protests against probabilism, 317
- Benediction** before eating, in Islam and Judaism, 177f.
- Bēnē Tobhim**, 46
- Ben Petori**, on Lev. xxv 35–6, 307*.
- Ben Yohai**, see Simeon b. Yohai
- Bereshith Rabba**, the divine Wisdom in, 75f.
- Berger, S.**, 219n.
- Bergson**, resemblance to Kabalism, 294
- Bergsträsser**, 150, 183, 184
- Bern**, the Disputation in, 1528, 276f.
- Bernard, E. R.**, 330n.
- Bernard of Clairvaux**, on Humility, 227; use of "judaizare", 119‡
- Beth 'Am**, title of Synagogue, 45
- Betho zu 'Ishto**, 49*
- Bevan, E. R.**, 220n.
- Beza**, on Servetus, 292*
- Bible**, its central place in Protestantism, 272ff.; Christian use of, against Jews, 124; criticism of, in ibn Ezra, 241; division into chapters, 192; influence of Arabia on, 158‡; Maimonides on, 237ff.; medieval Jewish and Christian attitude to, 237ff.; and the post-exilic period, 10; product of the Pharisaic Age, 9f.; in the Reformation, 256; of Sens, 192ff.; Servetus and criticism of, 290ff.; text of, disputes between Jews and Christians over, 123f.; Thomas Aquinas on, 239f.; variants, 9*; William of Ockham on, 240
- Bibles**, Hebrew, published at the beginning of the Reformation, 278
- Bibliander**, influence on the Church of Zurich, 290*
- Bibliolatry**, 237
- Birkat hash-shalom**, corresponds to salam, 166
- "**Birth pangs of the Messiah**", 37*
- Blackstone**, on legal fictions, 52, 308*
- Body of Christ**, Church as, in Paul, 82
- Boeschenstein, Andrew**, Hebrew teacher of Zwingli, 276
- Bois**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Bomberg, Daniel**, referred to by Elias Levita, xiii; and Elias Levita, 283; Hebrew Bible of, 278
- "**Books of Hermes**", 31*

- Bosporus**, evidence of syncretism from, 89*
- Bossuet**, on Jesuit treatment of penitents, 303; on Society of Jesus, 303
- Bouché-Leclercq**, on Alexandrine philosophy, 63*; on astrology, 100*
- Bownde, Nicolas**, *Doctrine of the Sabbath* of, 1595, 280‡
- Brabant, F. H.**, on the *Timaeus*, 64
- Braun, Dr M.**, 57n.
- Bréhier**, on Philo, 76†
- Breithaupt, J. F.**, translation of Rashi, 196*
- Brerewood, Edward**, in the Sab-batarian controversy, 281
- Brescia**, Hebrew Bible of, 278
- Brodrick**, 266
- Brotherhoods**, Pharisaic, 48f.; in Pharisaism, 45
- Büchler, A.**, conditions laid upon a proselyte, 42*; on the Lec-tionary, 9*; on sin, 32*
- Bukhari, Salat I**, 184n.; on social obligation, 179; on the 'Ulama, 180
- Bullinger**, at the Disputation in Bern 1528, 276
- Burkitt**, 56n.; on Apocalypse, 30; on Jesus in the cosmogony, 108; on *Metatron*, 33*
- Burnings** of the Talmud, 264f., 301; in Paris 1240, 204
- Bury St Edmunds**, fragment from, 264; Hebrew community at, until 1190, 198*
- Burying the dead**, 48
- Business**, relations with Gentiles in France, 213ff.; relations with Gentiles in Talmud, 212ff.
- Buxtorf**, and the vowel points, 285
- Byfield, Nicholas**, in the Sab-batarian controversy, 281
- Byng**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Cabbalah**, *see Kabbalah*
- Cain and Abel**, in the *Kur'an*, 157; in Islam, 159
- C.A.J.** 220n.; Jews in thirteenth century, 189*
- Cajetan, Cardinal**, on the argu-ments in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 291*
- "**Calculating the End**", 31*
- "**Calling**", Luther's doctrine of, 267ff.; Protestant idea of, 266
- Calvin**, and Marrano Judaism, 257; political theory of, 271
- Calvinism**, influence of Dutch Rabbinical scholars on, 266
- Calvinists**, use of the Psalms, 286
- Cambridge**, shorthand in Geni-zah, 15
- Canon**, of the O.T., a product of Pharisaic age, 11; of Scripture, 31*
- Canticles**, canonicity of, 31*
- Capitalism**, Judaism and, 266f.; relation between Jewish and Puritan, 270
- Captives**, redeeming, 48
- Caput**, 51
- Caro (Joseph)**, "Mentor Angel" of, 20†
- Cartwright, Thomas**, accused of wanting to retain Jewish laws, 279f.
- Casuistry**, applied to the Talmud, 211; definition of, 299f.; history of Jesuit, 314ff.; Jewish and Jesuit compared, 299ff.
- Catechumens**, anti-Jewish warn-ings to, 134
- Causes**, idea of, in Hebrew thought, 17f.
- Ceporinus**, Hebrew teacher of Zwingli, professor of Hebrew at Zurich, 276
- Châlons**, Council of (813), on confession, 314
- "**Chamber of the Secret Ones**", 46

- Chapman, A. T.**, on Ibn Ezra, 241
Chapters, division of Bible into, 192
Charles, false antithesis between Apocalypse and Halakhah, 30
Charitable societies, 244f.
Charity, 45, 49; Eleazar ben Isaac on, 243f.; in Islam, 179f., 242†; Jewish views of, 242ff.; Maimonides on, 243
Chatterton, a translator of the A.V., 278
Chazars, the, *see Khazars*
C.H.B., 78*, 111 addendum, 294n.
Christ, Jewish lives of, 131†
Christianity, debt of, to Hellenistic Judaism, 108f.; Judah hal-Levi on, 236f.
Christians, and idolatry, Jewish view of, 214f.; Jewish arguments against, 132f.; Jewish, in England, during the Reformation, 279ff.; Jewish, tests for, in Synagogue, 42†; Syrian, source of Jewish material in Islam, 160
“**Christians, pre-Incarnation**”, 127
Christology, the Reformation influenced by Jews, 289ff.
Chrysostom, John, on oath in Jewish manner, 140; sermons against the Jews, 129
Church, and debts owed to Jews, 249; a pre-Incarnation, paralleled in Judaism, 127*; vessels, Jewish dealings in, 216
Cicero (*Acad.* I, 26), 110n.; casuistry in, 300
Circumcision, postponement of, 43*
Civilization, how to study, 54f.
Clearchus of Soli, on the Jews, 116, 143n.
Clement IV, 194
Clement VII, support of Jews, 263
Clement of Alexandria, 104
Codex Justinianus, 143n.
Codex Theodosianus, 143n.
Cohen, A., on Maimonides, 126*; 251n.
Cohen, Jacques, on the English Bible, 202
Colossians, Jewish Gnosticism in Paul's Epistle to the, 88f.
Combefis, 144n.
Commentaries, influence of Jewish, on Reformation, 279
Communion, idea of, in Stoicism and Philo, 82
Complutensian Polyglot, 278
“**Conditions**” at Creation, 20
Confession, its place in the development of casuistry, 315ff.
Conscience, in the fulfilment of commandments, 312*
Constantine, legislation or conversion to Judaism, 117
Controversies between Jews and Christians, influence of, 141f.
Conversion to Judaism in the ancient world, 117
Cook, S. A., cited, 110n.
Corpus Hermeticum, traces of Jewish influence in, 103
Correctorium Parisiense, 192
Correctorium Vaticanum, 193; William of Mara author of, 198
Cossey, Henry, *Expositio super Psalmos*, 198*
Costessy, *see Cossey*
“**Council of the Four Lands**”, 218
Cowley, A. E., Aramaic Papyri, Ahikar story in the, 245*
Credit, commercial, made possible by Prošbul, 52
Crevier, M., on the study of Hebrew in Paris in 1430, 191*
Critical difficulties, recognized by Rabbis, 12*
Criticism, biblical, ibn Ezra as pioneer of, 241; Servetus, a pioneer of, 290ff.

- Cromwell** and Manasseh ben Israel, 282; and the Psalms, 287
Crusades, effects on Jews, 189*, 245; Jews after, 258
Cumont, 110 n.
Cusari, see *Kitab al-Khayari*
Custom, adaptation of law to, 208 ff.; relation of, to law, 211; and law, 309
- Daiches**, on Tyndale's knowledge of Hebrew, 220 addendum
Dam = "blood", in plural "blood-guilt, fine", 17
Daniel, 30; Book of, its position compared with that of the Apocalypse, 31*; in Protestantism, 31
Dante, on the confessional, 315
David, in the *Kur'an*, 157; story of, in Islam, 159
Daye, version of the Psalms, 288*
"Days of the Messiah", 37*
Decalogue, the, in the Dispersion, 85 ff.; excluded from synagogue services, 86 ff.; Muslims acquainted with, 154*; as a "mystery", 86; with the *Shema'*, 86, 87*; as the true Law, 86 ff.
δεῖγμα in Rabbinic theology, 75 f.
Demetrius, 48§
Demiurge, rejected by Pharisees, 33
Demons, personifications of disease, 32 f.
"Deposit of Faith", 20†
Derekh ha-Hayyim, 87*
Desportes, Abbé, French translation of the Psalms, 287
Deuterosis, 119
Deuterotai, in Epiphanius, 120
Diaspora, purpose of, to gain proselytes, 42
"Dibeches", 107†
Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne, 107†
- Dictionaries**, Hebrew, at the beginning of the Reformation, 278
Didascalia, the Golden Calf in, 126*; Law in, 86*
Die Geburt des Kindes, 72*
Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, 73
Dietary laws, in Islam, taken from Judaism, 178
Dina d'malkutha dina, parallel in Islam, 175 f.
Diocletian, concerning images, story of, 136*
Diodorus Siculus (I, 16), 111 n.; on Judaism, 91
Diogenes the Cynic, 111 n.
Diogenes Laertius (VI, 63), 111 n.; 143 n.
Diogenetus, Epistle to, on the interpretation of the Law, 126
Dion Cassius (*Hist. XXXVII*, 17), 143 n.
Dionysius (*Cod. Hier.*), on the salvation of the Gentiles, 230
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, speeches in, compared with Josephus, 94; on the state as a body, 82*; on the use of allegory, 71*
Divorce, enactments of Rabbinical synod on, 217; Henry VIII consults Jews on, 271; in Pharisaism, 50
Doctrine, Christian, influence on Jewish-Christian relations, 123
Dodd, C. H., on the influence of Judaism on the *Hermetica*, 103†
Dogma, and visions in the Roman Church, 20†
Dolet, Etienne, and the Psalms, 288*
Donatus of Istrius, and the Jews, 132
Donin, Nicholas, charges against the Jews, 214
Doreshe Hamurōth, 8, 11
Doreshe Reshumōth, 7, 11, 69§

- Dosetai** (or Dosithai) (R.) of Kokaba, and Gentiles, 42
- Dosithai** (R.) b. R. Yannai, on *Lishmah*, 318*
- Douai Bible**, on the Hebrew text, 282
- Dow, Christopher**, in the Sabatarian controversy, 281
- Doxographi Graeci*, 73
- Dozy**, on the meaning of *Mohatra*, 327*
- Driver, S. R.**, on usury in the Pentateuch, 322*
- Driver, S. R. and Neubauer, A.**, *catena* on Isa. LIII, 291*
- Dryden**, 26*
- Du'a*, corresponds to *Tahanunim*, 165
- Easter**, Jewish influence on date of, 141
- Eastern Churches**, O.T. heroes in calendars of, 127f.
- 'Ebed**, 50
- Ecclesiastes**, canonicity of, 31*; and future life, 25
- Ecclesiasticus**, the 'Amidah in, 25†; quoted in the Talmud, 31*; Wisdom in, 66f.
- Eck, Johann**, pupil of Elias Levita, 277*
- Eclipses**, in the *Tosefta*, 101
- 'Edah Kedoshah*, 8
- Eden**, pre-existence of, 27
- Education**, 48; elementary, in Judaism, 49; Luther, on Jewish, 275*
- Egidio (Aegidio)**, Cardinal, of Viterbo, and Elias Levita, xii, 283f.; pupil of Elias Levita, 277*
- "Eight Principal Men", 40
- Eighteen Benedictions**, and the *takbir*, 165 ff.
- Einhorn**, on a reading in *Gen.R.*, 9†
- Eleazar ben Isaac**, of Worms, ethical will of, on charity, 243f.
- Elbogen, I.**, on the Hagiographa and the Lectionary, 31*
- Elegit*, writ of, Jewish influence on, 50, 301*
- Elephantine papyri**, *Ahiqar* story in, 245†
- Elhanan** (R.), on English Jews, 215
- Elias del Medigo**, Hebrew teacher of Pico de Mirandola, 277*
- Eliezer** (R.), on deliverance, 101
- Eliezer (R.) of Beaugency**, exegesis of, 196
- Eliezer (R.) (Eleazar) b. Hyrcanus**, will of Eleazar b. Isaac of Worms ascribed to, 244*; on the Wise, 46*
- Eliezer (R.) of Metz**, on dealing in church vessels, 216; on trading with Christians, 214f.
- Elijah**, 40; prayers of, for Israel, 134f.
- Elisha and the bears**, 17
- Elizabeth, Queen**, Tremellius a favourite of, 279*
- Elvira, Canon** 49, 144n.
- Emperors**, cult of, 88
- "End", see **Eschatology, Revealing, Calculating**
- Enelow, H. G.**, on *Kawwanah*, 320*
- England**, distribution of Jews in, 209; Jewish influence in, in the seventeenth century, 279; Jews in, 1066-1290, 250; Jews expelled from, 1290, 258; Norman, laxity of Jews in regard to wine, 215; state dealings with Jews, 249f.
- English Christians**, knowledge of Hebrew among, 198*
- Enoch**, books credited to, 95
- Ephraem Syrus**, Muhammad indebted to, 151
- Epicurus**, 108; rabbinical hostility to, 74

- Epiphanes**, used of God by Philo, 83†
- ἐπιφανεῖαι, use of, by Josephus, 83
- Epiphanius**, on Jewish heretics, 120; on Jewish-Christian heretics, 128*
- Epistle to Diognetus*, interpretation of the Law, 126
- Equiprobabilism**, 316
- Erasmus**, and Luther's translations of the Psalms, 287
- 'Erubh Tabhshilin, a legal fiction, 310f.
- 'Erubin, legal fictions in, 310
- Eschatology**, Muslim, 154ff.; *see also Second Coming and End*
- Escobar**, casuistry applied to usury by, 327f.
- Esdras II (IV Esdras)**, and the Second Coming, 36; and the *Kur'an*, 155; pessimism in, 98
- Esoteric school** of interpretation, 12f.
- Essenes**, Hellenistic element in, 91ff.; Josephus on, 90f.; Philo on, 91; prayers of, 34*; solar element in their religion, 90ff.
- Esther* called *Kabbalah*, 31*
- "Eternal", meaning of, 28*
- "Ethical monotheism", 102
- Ethics of the Fathers**, *see Abot*
- Ethics**, Catholic social, and the Reformers, 267f.; Greek and Jewish compared, 19; Henry VIII and Jewish, 271; social, Protestant and Jewish, 266ff.; of Stoicism, 66
- Eucharist**, in Church of England, compared with synagogue worship, 45
- Eudaimonism**, Antigonus of Sokho on, 27, 53
- Euergetes**, used of God by Philo, 83†
- Euripides**, *Iphigeneia in Tauris* compared with Gen. xxii, 18f.
- Europeanization** of Jewry, 219
- Eusebius**, 80; *Dem. Evan.* I, 143n.; *Praep. Evan.*, 79*; III, II, 29, 110n.; IX, 16 seq., 111n.; VII, X, 143n.; *Prov. Evang.* IX, 28, 111n.; Alexandrine Jewish fragments preserved in, 62; on Origen, 100*; distinction between "Hebrews" and "Jews" in, 127f.; on Jewish anti-Christian letter, 131*; preserves Jewish Midrash, 94
- Eusebius of Emessa**, 144n.
- Evelyn, John**, on Dutch attitude to Jews, 266
- Evreux**, Jewish schools at, 193; Talmudic studies at, 198
- Excommunication**, of Jewish-Christians in the second century, 115; pronounced by Rabbinical Synods, 217
- Exegesis**, Christian use of Kabballistic methods of, 293f.; influence of Jewish in France of thirteenth century on Christian, 194ff.; Jewish and Christian aims in, 122f.; Jewish, used by Christian Hebraists of the Reformation, 279; of Nicholas de Lyra, 198; Pharisaic, 11; purpose of Jewish and Christian contrasted, 129f.; schools of, 11f.
- Exodus**, in form of a Greek tragedy, 94; the, treatment by Josephus, 83
- Ezekiel**, mysticism of, 14, 105; mysticism of, in the Rabbis, 14; not in the *Kur'an*, 157*
- Ezekiel** (Alexandria?), composed an account of the Exodus in form of Greek tragedy, 94
- Ezra* called *Kabbalah*, 31*
- Ezra**, work of, 8ff.
- Ezra Apocalypse**, *see Esdras II*
- Ezra IV**, *see Esdras II*

- Fagius, Paul**, and Elias Levita, xii; Elias Levita on, xiii
- Fall of Adam**, in Philo, 76f.
- Fasts**, Muslim, distinguished from Jewish, 160; in Pharisaic brotherhoods, 48
- Fate**, in Judaism, 94ff.; in Paul, 99ff.; in Philo, 96f.
- Fatherhood of God**, 16, 148
- Fathers, Ethics of the*, see *Aboth*
- Fathers of the Church**, the Jews in, 119ff.; Jewish interpretations in, 122
- Feasts**, Christian participation in Jewish, 141; Jewish, influence of, on Christians, 141
- Ferdinand and Isabella**, religious policy of, 258f.
- Feudal Period**, Jews and Christians in, 223ff.
- Feudalism**, the relation of Jews to, 246
- Fifth Monarchy Men**, 281f.
- Fikh**, 170f.; influence of, on Judaism, 181
- Final Concords**, 50
- Finance**, Jewish place in mediaeval, 247
- Finkelstein, L.**, on the '*Amidah*', 42†; on Jewish synods, 217*
- Firstlings**, treatment with '*Or-mah*', 306
- Fons Vitae* of Solomon ibn Gabirol, 203f.
- Forgiveness**, Rabbinical views of, 134f.
- "Four Smiths"**, 40
- Fox, George**, "Voices" of, 20†
- France**, distribution of Jews in, 209; Jews of, free from massacres, 189*; Jews of southern, compared with those of northern, 210f.; Jewish expositors of, 195ff.; Jewish relations to Gentiles in, 212ff.; policy of kings of, about Jews, 258
- Francis I**, xiii
- Francis of Assisi**, visions and "Stigmata" of, 20†
- François de Sales, St**, and the Psalms, 287
- Friday**, as day of public worship in Islam, 161
- Friedländer, I.**, 184n.; on relation between Jewish and Christian prayer, 162f.
- Fück**, estimate of Muhammad's originality, 182*
- Fukahā**, 170f.; under the early 'Abbasids parallel to the Pharisées, 180f.
- Fulke, Dr**, on the vowel points, 285
- Future life**, in Islam, 174; in Pharisaism, 25f.; see also *Immortality*
- Gabirol**, see *Solomon ibn Gabirol*
- Gabriel**, and the *Kur'an*, 152
- Galatinus**, his *De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis* translated by Elias Levita, 284
- Gamaliel, Rabban**, on usury, 323
- Gaspar da Gama**, 262
- Gehenna**, pre-existence of, 27
- Geiger, A.**, on Judaism and Islam, 150, 183; on the school of Rashi, 196f.
- Gematria**, 12ff.; in Raymond Lully, 205
- Gentiles**, 29*, 40, 41; Jewish attitude to exacting usury from, 322ff.; Maimonides on good, 233f.; Pharisaic attitude to, 41ff.; Talmud regulations on intercourse with, 212ff.
- George (the Monk) (George Monachos Hamartolus)**, on Jews and the Iconoclastic controversy, 136; on Leo the Isaurian and the Jews, 136
- Germany**, Isaac Zarphati on persecution in, 261; Jews in, 189*, 259f.; Kabbalah in, 257

- Gershom, Rabbenu**, 50; decrees monogamy, 207, 217
- Ghetto**, the, in the Renaissance and Reformation, 255
- Gifts to Gentiles**, 42
- Gilbert of Westminster**, arguments with a Rabbi, 279*
- Ginsburg**, 294 n., 295 n.; on the attempt to derive Christian doctrine by Kabbalistic methods, 294
- Ginsburger**, M., on a reading in the Targum, 178†
- Gleaning**, in the Middle Ages, 246
- Gnomon**, 103†
- Gnostic sects**, debt to Judaism, 139
- Gnosticism**, combined with Judaism at Colossae, 88 f.; the Kabbalah a form of, 293; traces of, in Rabbinic Judaism, 104 ff.
- God**, in the Alexandrine Stoics, 63 ff.; attributes of, 24; attributes of, in Thomas Aquinas, based on Maimonides, 205; character of, in Islam, 154; the cosmos as his robe, 79 f.; Greek views of, contrasted with Pharisaic, 18 f.; immanence and transcendence of, 23 f.; Pharisaic idea of, 16 f.
- Godeau, Bishop**, French translation of the Psalms, 287; on Protestant knowledge of the Psalms, 286
- Goitein, S. D.**, on Biblical characters in the *Kur'an*, 159*; on the Hebrew Prophets and Psalms in the *Kur'an*, 154*; on Islam and Judaism, 150, 183; on witchcraft in Judaism and Islam, 178 f.
- Golden Calf**, the law a punishment for, 86
- Golden Rule**, in Islam and Judaism, 180
- Goldschmidt, L.**, on *Mene Tekel* in the Talmud, 13*; on the phrase "Sovereign of the World", 156*
- Goldziher, I.**, 183, 184 n., 185 n.; on the benediction before eating, 178*; on Halakhah in Islam, 180†; on Islam and Judaism, 150; on the *Mahdi*, 177†; on *Shari'a*, 171*
- Gonebh Da'ath**, 312*, 318*
- Graeco-Roman World**, Jews in, 116 ff.
- Graetz**, on trade in church vessels, 216
- Grammars**, Hebrew, at the beginning of the Reformation, 278
- Grammateia**, 12 f.; in Revelation, 14
- Grayzel, S.**, see *C.A.J.*
- Gregory of Nyssa**, on Jewish interpretations, 122*
- Gregory the Great**, on Jewish Christian heretics, 138*
- Gregory VII**, opposed to confiscation of possessions of Jewish converts, 251
- Grisar**, on Luther's anti-Semitism, 260*
- Grosseteste**, on the Cahorsini, 327
- Grünbaum, M.**, 184 n.; on Islam and Judaism, 150
- Güdemann, M.**, 220 n.; on French Jewry, 210; on the Hussites, 265; on Melanchthon's use of Jewish expressions, 275*; see also *J.C.R.*
- Guppy, H.**, on the English Bible, 201†
- Gusa**, 49*
- Guthrie**, on Orphic religion, 77*, 80*
- Guttmann, Jacob**, on the influence of Maimonides, 205*
- Ha'aramath Ribbith**, 325*
- Haburoth**, 48 f.
- Hadith**, its importance, 171 f.; influence on *Aggadah*, 159 f.

- Hadrian**, 104; prohibition of circumcision by, 119
- Haggadah**, influenced by Muslim *Hadith*, 159f.; Muhammad's dependence on, 152; Philonian Logos in, 7*; Rashi and, 195*
- Haggadot Maim.* on *Ma'akhloth 'Asuroth*, 213*
- Hagiographa**, canonicity of, 31*; position of, 31*
- Hai Gaon**, miracle in hymn attributed to, 23
- Hakhamim**, 'Ulamā, the equivalent of, 170f.
- Halakhah*, founded on Hagiographa, 31*; influence on Muslim law, 168ff.; the schools of Hillel and Shammai on, 185 addendum; *Shari'a* equivalent to, 170
- Halakhah le-Mosheh miš-Sinai*, counterpart in Islam, 169f.; and 'isnād, 172
- Hall, Joseph**, and casuistry, 300
- Hamartolus**, see **George the Monk**
- Hana (R.) bar Bizna** (on Zech. II, 3), 40
- Hanhagah* of Asher b. Yehiel, on humility, 228
- Hanif**, meaning of, in Arabic, 158†; Abraham, a *hanif*, 158
- Hanilai (R.)**, 49*
- Hanina (R.)**, on the rule of the planets, 101§
- Hanina's wife**, 49*
- Hannah's prayer**, 36*
- Hanucah oil**, 23
- Harafoth* and *Dera'on*, 28
- Harding**, a translator of the A.V., 278; on the vowel points, 285
- Harrison**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Harvard Theol. Rev.*, 89*, 103*
- Hasidim**, views on miracles, 20†
- Hazzan** corresponds to *mu'addin*, 166
- Hebrei**=Dominican Vulgate, 192
- Hebrew**, books published at the beginning of the Reformation, 278; Luther on the study of, 277; teaching of, to Gentiles, 212; vocabulary, 32; Zwingli on the study of, 275f.
- "**Hebrews**", distinguished from Jews, 128
- Hebrews, Gospel of*, 131†
- Heinemann, I.**, on Philo, 76†
- Hekkesh* (analogy), Muslim parallels to, 174
- Hellenistic Judaism**, sources for, 61f.
- Heller, B.**, on Islam and Judaism, 150, 183
- Hemerobaptists**, Epiphanius on, 120f.
- Henri I Estienne**, and the Psalms, 288*
- Henry VIII**, and Rabbi Mark Raphael of Venice, 271f.
- Heraclitus**, 17
- "**Herennius**"=Philo of Byblus in Lydus, 104*
- Heresies**, Jewish-Christian, in England during the Reformation, 279ff.
- "**Heresy**", a bridge between Christianity and Judaism, 137
- Heretics**, influence of Kabbalah on, 256*; Jewish-Christian, in the early Church, 138f.; and Jews in Poland, 265f.; and Jews in Spain, 226
- Herford, Travers**, 56n.; on the *Minim*, 130*
- Herman, E.**, on mysticism, 20†
- Hermes**, Books of, 31*
- "**Hermes**", in the Mishnah, 105
- Hermetic cosmogony**, interest of Pharisees in, 105f.; literature, sacrifice in, 81
- Hermippus**, 143n.
- Herodians**, Epiphanius on, 120f.
- Het*'= "punishment" and "sin", 17

- H.E.W.**, humility in, 228f.; on the will of Eleazar of Worms, 243f.
- Hhony (Onias)**, miracle worker, 23
- Hierocles**, 74*
- High Priest**, in Philo, 81f.; symbolism of his garments, 79f.
- Hilary**, on the Law, 126
- Hillel**, Golden Rule of, 180; invented *Prosbūl*, 52, 311
- Hillel and Shammai**, difference between schools of, 50; schools of, on *Halakhah*, 185 addendum *Hilyat al-'awliyā*, 154*
- Hippolytus**, alleged citation of, by Josephus, 34*
- Hirsch, S. A.**, 219n.; on early English Hebraists, 274*; on the knowledge of Hebrew among English Christians, 198*; on the Temple of Onias, 80†
- Hirschfeld**, on Islam and Judaism, 150; on the Karaits, 160*
- Hishtahawayoth**, practised by Jews of Arabia, 165
- History of the (Jewish) Patriarchs* (Arabic), on O.T. Christians, 127*; (Coptic), Jew in, 133
- History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* (Arabic), 144 n.
- H.J.E.**, 295n.; distribution of Jews, 209*; on Tremellius, 279*
- Holland**, Jews in, 265f.
- Holmes**, on pre-existence (in *Wisd. ix*, 8), 27
- Holy Communion**, the reformers' doctrine of, influenced by Judaism, 289f.
- "Holy Congregation"**, 8
- Holy Roman Empire**, and the Jews, 262
- Homer**, 31*
- Homer*, of the Torah, 11
- Homeros**, Books of, meaning of, 105
- Hopkins**, translation of the Psalms, 288*
- Horovitz, Josef**, 184n.; on Islam and Judaism, 150, 183
- Hostel**, attached to Synagogue, 45
- Huidekoper**, on Judaism at Rome, 119†
- Human life**, respect for, in Pharisaism, 51*
- Humanitarianism**, 51*
- Humility**, Judah hal-Levi on, 236f.; in mediaeval Judaism and Christianity, 227ff.
- Huna (R.)**, on astrology, 99*
- Hus, John**, in Poland, 265
- Hushim**, 9*
- Hussites**, of Prague, use of Hebrew psalms, 265
- Hutbah**, origin of, 164
- Hutchinsonians**, their requirement of Hebrew for full membership, 274
- Hyamson, A. M.**, *see H.J.E.*
- Hyamson, M.**, on the Decalogue and the Torah, 87*
- Hypsistos**, 89*
- Iao**, Apollo of Claros on, 104; Philo of Byblos on, 104
- Ibn al-Athir**, biblical stories, 159
- Ibn Ezra**, *see Abraham ibn Ezra*
- Iconoclasm**, influence of Islam on, 136; influence of Judaism on, 135f.
- Ideas**, Platonic theory of, 27
- Idolatry**, 41; Christians and, Jewish view of, 214; Luther's views on, 289; rejection of, 42*; Zwingli's views on, based on Jewish attitude, 289
- 'Iggereth Musar** of Moses Nahmanides, 228
- 'Ijma'**, in Maimonides, 181; roots in Judaism, 172
- Ikam-as-salat**, 165

- 'Ikara*, 33
'Imām, origin of, 164
Immanence, Divine, 23f.
Immanentalism, in the Kabalah, 293f.
Immortality, in Daniel, 10; in Philo, 76f.; *see also Future life*
Index, the Roman, and Hebrew writings, 263
Infant baptism, a legal fiction, 309
Infanticide, 51*
'Injil, in the *Kur'an* = the Gospel, 152
Innocent III, the Church under, 189; on Jewish blindness, 199; prohibits Jews dealing in Church vessels, 216; protest against Jews employing Christians, 214; and the University of Paris, 190f.
Innocent XI, and usury, 328
Inquisition, 255
Intention, Jesuit doctrine of, and *Lishmah*, 321; in Judaism, 312
Inwardness, in Judaism, 318*
Iphigeneia (*Tauris*, *Aulis*), 19 and 19*
'Iqqar, 312*
Irenaeus, on exorcism, 107†; on the Law, 126
Isaac, sacrifice of, compared with the *Iphigeneia in Tauris*, 18f.; sacrifice of, in the *Kur'an*, 158f.; sacrifice of, in Rabbinic preaching, 134f.
Isaac Arama, 78*
Isaac Zarphati, on persecution in Germany, 261f.; on Turkey, 261f.
Isaac Israeli, earliest Jewish philosopher in Latin West, 204
Isaac of Dampierre, on selling animals to Gentiles, 215f.
Isagoge of Odo, the, 198*
Isaiah called Kabbalah, 31†; Muslims acquainted with first chapter of, 154*
- Ishmael**, importance of, in Islam, 158f.; story of, in Islam, 159
Ishmael (R.), School of, 11
Isidore of Pelusium, 144n.
Isis, 82, 83, 100; identified with Wisdom, 67
Islam, charity in, 242†; dietary laws in, 178; five daily prayers in, 164ff.; influence on iconoclasm, 136; institutions borrowed from Judaism, 160ff.; Judah hal-Levi on, 237; Maimonides on, 234; marriage laws in, 178; meaning of, 147; Messianic idea in, 176f.; public worship on Friday, 161; ritual slaughter of animals in, 161; rules concerning purity and ablutions borrowed from Jews, 165; schools in, 172; source of its influence, 149; usury in, 180; witchcraft in, 178f.; worship of, in relation to Judaism and Christianity, 162ff.
'Isnād, in Maimonides, 181; and *halakhah le-Mosheh mi-Sinai*, 172
Israiliyāt, tendency against, in Muslim tradition, 153f.
Italy, Jews in, 226, 263f.
Ius talionis, in Islam and Judaism, 179; *see also Lex talionis*
- Jacks**, on the Ras Shamra texts, 97†
Jacob, 40
Jacob, son of Asher b. Yehiel, 218
Jacob ben Yehiel Loans, Hebrew teacher of Reuchlin, 277*
Jacob b. Me'ir Tam, *see Tam (R.)*
Jacob Perez de Valencia, on the origin of vowel points, 284
Jacob of Serug, *Homilies I*, 144n.
Jacobite Christians, use "Jew" as a term of abuse, 137f.
Jacobite Synaxary, on Maccaean Martyrs, 127†
Jacobs, J., on Aaron of Lincoln, 247*; on Jews in England, 209; *see also J.A.E.*

- J.A.E.**, 220n.; on disputations between Jews and Christians, 279*; on Jews in finance, 247*
- James, M.**, 294n.; on Protestant commercial ethics, 266f.
- Jansenists**, a parallel to Pharisees, 308
- Jastrow**, on *Peshat*, 129†
- J.C.R.**, 275*
- Jebb, R. C.**, on the *Iphigeneia at Aulis*, 19*
- Jechiel, Jehiel**, *see* *Yehiel*
- Jehudah**, *see* *Judah*
- Jeremiah**, Muslims acquainted with, 154*
- Jerome**, 193; *Ep. xxxii*, 143n.; *Ep. cxxi*, 143n.; on Jewish anti-Christian letter, 131*; on Jewish-Christian heretics, 138*; on the Law, 126; on the misfortunes of the Jews, 128; on the Psalms, quoted by Sir Walter Raleigh, 288; views on the Rabbis, 121f.; warnings against Jews, 122*; Zwingli on his exegesis, 288
- Jerusalem**, blessing of, 42†
- Jeshu**, Jewish lives of, 131f.
- Jesse**, 40
- Jessica**, in *Merchant of Venice*, 195†
- Jessop, Rev. G. L. O.**, 52§
- Jesuits**, devotion to Law, 302; effect of propaganda of, on Jewish printers, 263
- Jesus**, Jewish lives of, 131f.; Maimonides' view of, 234; and the Sabbath, 307f.
- Jewish-Christian** heretics, the Fathers on, 138*; in the seventeenth century, 279
- Jewish Christians**, excommunication of, 115
- Jewry**, Europeanization of, 219
- J.L.**, 220n., 251n., 294n., 330n.; on Jewish synods, 217*; on Jews and Christians, 301*
- Joan of Arc**, "Voices" of, 20†
- Jochanan, Johanan**, *see* *Yohanan*
- Johanan (R.)**, 41*
- John the Baptist**, salvation of, 230
- John (St) of the Cross**, on supernatural revelation, 20†
- John of Nikious**, 144n.
- Jolowicz**, on *'on'a'ah* and *laesio enormis*, 331 addendum
- Jonah**, in the *Kur'an*, 154*, 157; story of, in Islam, 159
- Jose**, *see* *Yoše*
- Joseph**, story of, in Islam, 159
- Joseph of Lamego**, his part in Portuguese colonial expansion, 262
- Joseph Bekhor Shor**, on the Christians, 197; exegesis of, 196f.
- Joseph, M.**, 251n.
- Josephus**, 61ff.; on Aaron's robes, 79; account of an exorcism, 107; character of his works, 61f.; on the Decalogue, 85f.; on elementary education, 57n.; and Essenes, 34*; on the Essenes, 90; on the Pharisees, 46*; on the revelation of the Name to Moses, 82f.; speeches in, 94
- Joshua (R.)**, on eating meat after the destruction of the Temple, 302*; on miracles, 22*
- Joy in religion**, 48
- Jubilees, Book of**, Palestinian character of, 92; the feasts in, 127*; compared with *Kur'an*, 155
- Jud.**, 55n., 111n.; on the Decalogue, 86§
- Judah**, son of Asher b. Yehiel, on humility, 228f.
- "**Judah the Prince**", in Epihanius, 120
- Judah hal-Levi**, on humility, 236f.; influenced by Muslims, 150; on other religions, 236f.
- Judah (R.) Larma**, on book burnings at Venice, 265

- "Judaizare"**, use by Bernard of Clairvaux, 119‡
- Judaizing Christians**, in the early Church, 137f.
- "Judaizing"**, Christian Hebraists accused of, during Reformation, 273
- Judan**, *see Yudan*
- Judgement**, Day of, in Islam, 154f.
- Julia Severa**, Phrygian High Priestess, wife of synagogue ruler, 88
- Juliana of Norwich**, liberality of, 230
- Juster**, 143n.; on the prohibition of circumcision by Hadrian, 119†
- Justin Martyr**, *Tryphon*, cap. 46, 143n.; cap. 47, 143n.; on Jewish anti-Christian letter, 131*; definition of the Jewish faith, 120; on Jewish cursing of Christians, 42†
- Justinian**, actions against the Jews, 117f.; legislation about Jews, 119; *Novella*, 146, ch. II, 143n.; regulation of the synagogue services, 119*
- Juvenal**, on the Jews, 116f.
- Juynboll**, on Islam and Judaism, 150
- Ka'bah**, Abraham and the, 158f.
- Kabbalah**, Christian interest in, 205f.; Elias Levita instructs Egidio in, 283f.; used for Hagiographa and the prophets, 31*; the impetus to Hebrew studies given by, 293; influence of, on the Renaissance, 292; and the Renaissance, 256f.
- Kal wahomer**, equivalent method in Islam, 174
- Kara, Joseph**, exegesis of, 196
- Karaites**, description of, 160*; influence on Islam, 160; Maimo-
- nides on, 235; Obadiah of Bertinoro on, 213*
- Kautsky**, on hatred of Jews in Reformation times, 259
- Kawwanah**, 312, 318f.; and ca-suistry, 320f.; corresponds to *Niyya*, 166
- Kayserling**, on Jews and exploration, 294n.
- Kedush-shah**, man combines with angels in, 34
- Kehala Kaddisha**, 8
- Kempis, Thomas à**, on Humility, 227
- Kenyon**, on Greek astrological terms, 100*
- Keri'ath Shema'**, and Muslim *Kir'a*, 166
- Keri'oth**, practised by Jews of Arabia, 165
- Kesusah**, 322*
- Kether**, the, of the Torah, 87*
- Kethubbah** = marriage covenant, 50
- K'far Perekho**, source of *Perekh* nuts, 243*
- Khazars**, 226*, 236
- Kiblah**, changed from Jerusalem to Mecca, 161
- Kiddush**, compared with Anglican worship, 45
- Kilbye**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Kimhi**, commentaries of, available to Christian scholars, 279; influenced by schools of Akiba and Ishmael, 12
- Kimhis**, at Narbonne, 226
- King**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- King, G. Brockwell**, on the Golden Rule, 180*
- Kingsley**, on miracles, 20†
- Kira'a** identified with *Keri'at Shema'*, 166
- Kish-shuf'** in Islam, 178f.
- Kislew**, Melanchthon's derivation of, 275*

- Kitab al-Khayari* of Judah ha-Levi, 236f.
- Kittel**, Rabbinic texts of, xii
Kiydm, derivation of, 165*; equivalent to 'Amidah, 165
Kiyas, 173f.
- Klausner**, J., on Jewish lives of Christ, 131†; on the Messianic idea, 37*
- Klein**, S., on Synagogue hostel, 45‡
- Kneeling**, origin of, in Muslim worship, 163
- Kohen Sedeck*, 40
- Kohler**, on Hermes, in the Mishnah, 105*; on Josephus and the Essenes, 34*
- κοινωνία*, in Stoics and Philo, 82
- Korah**, redeemed by prayer of Hannah, 36*
- Krauss**, S., 144n.; on δεύμα, 75*; on Jerome and the Nazarenes, 138*; on Jewish lives of Christ, 131†
- Kuppah shel sedakah*, 45
- Kur'an*, Abraham in, 151, 158f.; biblical characters in, 157; brought from heaven by Gabriel, 152f.; formulae in, paralleled in Jewish sources, 156; Muhammad's view of its relation to the Bible, 152; Muslim criticism of, influenced by Karaites, 160; parallels to apocryphal and apocalyptic literature in, 155f.; pre-existence of, 27; the prophets in, 154*
- Labourer**, position of, in Pharisaism, 51*
- Ladino**, books in, 245†
- Laesio enormis*, 'onā'ah possibly the origin of, 331 addendum
- Lake**, Kirsopp, on syncretism, 89*
- Land laws**, 51
- Lane**, on the meaning of *Mohatra*, 327*; on *Zabur*, 152*
- Langton, Stephen**, divides Hebrew Bible into chapters, 192
- Languedoc**, freedom of Jews in, 225f.; Jews in, 258
- Laodicea**, *Canon* 16, 144n.; *Canon* 29, 144n.
- "**Last Judgement**", 31
- Lateran Council** (1215), lays down the obligation of annual confession, 315
- Lattey, Fr. C. C., S.J.**, on dogma and visions, 20†
- Law**, abolition of the, in Christian theology, 125f.; abolition of the, Paul's view, 125f.; and custom, 309; and custom, adaptation of, 208ff.; devotion of the Society of Jesus to, 302; differences in Jewish and Muslim study of, 175; Jewish, influence on Muslim, 167; its position in Pharisaism in place of dogma, 301; relation of custom to, 211; see also **Torah**
- Law** (Plato), 19
- Lea, H. C.**, 251n.; on Jews in Languedoc, 225f.
- Lectionary**, attributed to Ezra, 9; use of Baruch in, 31*
- Legacy of Islam*, 183
- Legacy of Israel*, 4, 183, 203, 204, 205*, 220n.
- Legal fictions** in Pharisaism, 52; in Judaism, 308ff.
- Leges Visigothorum*, 143n.
- Leicester**, 199
- Leo Judae (Judah)**, influence on the Church of Zurich, 290*; on Kabbalah, 256
- Le 'Olam*, meaning of, 28*
- Leo the Isaurian**, interview with a Jew, 136
- Leucippus**, 108
- Leveen, J.**, on Muhammad and the Jews, 183

- Levi (R.)**, on astrology, 99*; on the *Shema'*, 87*; on true deliverance, 101
- Levinsohn, J. B.**, on Jewish views of Christians and idolatry, 214*
- Levita, Elias**, friendship with Christians, xii; in the discussion on the vowel points, 283 ff.; Hebrew pupils of, 277*; *Massoreth Hamassoreth* of, 284
- Levy, J.**, on *Semukhim*, 15†; on δεύμα, 75*
- Levy, R.**, on the sociology of Islam, 184
- Levy, S.**, on "Original Virtue", 36
- Lex talionis*, commutation of, 48§; *see also Jus talionis*
- Liber, M.**, biography of Rashi, 196*; on the *Tosafists*, 193*
- Liberalism**, Jews pioneers of, 225
- Lichtenstein, Hans**, on the holiday on Tammuz 4, 48§
- Lightfoot, Bishop**, accused of being a "Rabbi", 273
- Lightfoot, J.**, Hebrew learning of, 282
- Lincoln, F. Ashe**, 57n., 251n., 331n.; on the influence of Jews on English law, 301*
- Lisbon**, destruction of Hebrew books in, 264
- Lishmah*, 312, 319ff.
- Liskath Ha'sha'im*, 46
- Lively**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Livingstone, Sir R. W.**, on civilization, 54f.; on the Greek, 18
- Livy**, the story of Menenius Agrippa, 82*
- Loewe, H.**, on casuistry applied to the Second Tithe, 305; on Jewish attitude to credit, 248; and Latin Hebrew Psalter, 198*; on 'Ormah, 304‡; on Sabbath Angels, 35*; *see also S.C.B.M.*
- Loewe and Montefiore, Rabbinic Anthology**, proselytes in, 43*; *Rabbinic Anthology* on esoteric forms of the Tetragrammaton, 83*; on *Kawanah*, 319
- Loewe, J. H.**, translation of Rashi, 196*
- Logos**, equivalent of the Targumic *Memra*, 33; not due to sense of incompleteness in Judaism, 109†; in Philo, 65; use of, by Philo, 68 ff.; Philonian, possibly known to Haggadists, 7*
- Löw, L.**, on date of Talmud, 6; on *Doreshe Reshumoth* and *Hamuroth*, 7*; on the position of Jews in the Roman Empire, 117†; on the Panticapaeum inscriptions, 89*; on statue of Persian king in Synagogue, 35†
- Lowe, W. H.**, on the text of *Sanh.* x 1, 25–6
- Lucas of Tuy**, on heretics who become Jews, 226
- Lucian**, his Epicurean view of the mysteries, 85*
- Lully, Raymond**, and the *Cabbala*, 205
- Luther**, anti-Semitism of, 260; on the conception of "calling", 267 ff.; his indebtedness to the Jews, 277*; indirect influence of Rashi on, 12; influenced by Lyra, 200; on Jewish education, 275*; and the Psalms, 286; on the study of Hebrew, 277
- Lydus, De Mensibus**, 104*
- Lyons, Council of** (1274), penance made a sacrament at, 314f.
- Lyra, Nicholas de**, career of, 197f.; debt of the Reformation to, 274f.; exegesis of, 198; influence on Luther, 12, 200; influenced by Rashi, 12
- Ma'aser Sheni*, treatment by 'Ormah, 305f.

- Macaulay**, on the A.V., 201
Maccabees, Epiphanius on, 120
McIver, 220n.
Macon, *Canon* 15, 144 n.
Macrobius, on Iao, 104‡; reconciles Virgil and Cicero, 63*
Maddhib, 172
Magic, enactments against Jewish, at Worcester 1246, 200; in Josephus, 107; and medicine, 106f.; R. Me'ir and, 106f.; Origen on use of divine names in, 107
Magical papyri, Jewish material in, 106ff.
Mahdi, equivalent of *Messiah*, 176; origin of, 177
Maimonides, xiii, 203, 205; attitude to Islam and Christianity, 234f.; on casuistry applied to usury, 324f.; on direct interest to Gentiles, 322*; on givers of charity, 243f.; on the "Holy Congregation", 8*; on Humanity, 227f.; influenced by *Fikh*, 181; influenced by Muslims, 150; his influence on Servetus, 291; introduced to Christian thought, 204; on *Kawanah*, 318*; on the meaning of Scripture, 237ff.; on the music of the spheres, 78*; on nominal Jews, 235; on the reasonableness of Torah, 233ff.; views on Christianity, 214; views on sacrifice, 126
Maine, on legal fictions, 308
Makbm, used for God, 76
Malebranche, Servetus a precursor of, 292
Málik ibn Dínar, and the knowledge of the Hebrew prophets, 154*
Mammash, parallel in Islam, 179
Man, the microcosm, in Stoicism, 64ff.; the microcosm, in Rabbinic theology, 76
Manasseh ben Israel, and Cromwell, 281f.
Manon, 14*
Mar Ukba, wife of, 49*
Margoliouth, on the relations between Arabs and Israelites, 150*
Margoliouth, Mrs., on Syriac parallel to 'ahizath 'eynayim, 178†
Mark (R.) Raphael of Venice, and Henry VIII, 271f.
Marmorstein, A., 184n.; on the "Letter of Jochanan ben Zakai", 131*
Marot, emulators of, 287; translation of the Psalms of, 288*
Marrano Judaism, influence on Michael Servetus, 257
Marriage, Muslim laws on, 178
Martyr, Peter, taught by Italian Jews, 277*
Mashkon meth = mortgage, 250
Mass, reminiscent of Temple sacrifices, 45
Massoreth Hamassoreth of Elias Levita, 284
ματαιότης, meaning of, 100†
Matthew, Hebrew Gospel of, 133f.
Matthews, Thomas, Jewish sources of notes in his Bible, 279
Maurillac, Michel de, French translation of the Psalms of, 287
"Mediator", Isaac as, 135
Mediators, in Pharisaism, 33
Medina, see **Bartolomé de Medina**
Megander, at the Disputation in Bern 1528, 277
Megasthenes, 143n.
Me'ir (R.), 42; on charity, 243*; on *Kawanah*, 318*; on magic, 106f.; subtlety of, 304; a reading in his Torah, 9†, 57 addendum
Mekor Hayyim of Solomon ibn Gabirol, 203f.
Melanchthon, use of Jewish expressions by, 275*

- Melchizedek**, type of Gentile proselyte, 40
- Memra**, as an intermediary, 33; its connexion with the Alexandrine Logos, 76
- "**Men of the Great Synagogue**", 7f.; and the prayers, 45†
- Menahem**, as name of the Messiah, 13*
- Mendelssohn**, on miracles, 20†
- Menenius Agrippa**, 82*
- Mene Tekel*, interpretation by *At-Bash*, 13*
- Mercy**, of God, in Pharisaism, 16f.
- Merits**, of the children, 36; of the Patriarchs, 36
- Merswin**, *see Rulman Merswin*
- Merx, Adalbert**, on Nicholas de Lyra, 197‡
- Meshullam**, 214
- Messiah**, Christian arguments about, 129f.; Jewish arguments against Christians, 130f.; in Pharisaism, 37ff.; son of Joseph, 40; to be a proselyte, 40
- "**Messiah, birth pangs of the**", 37*
- Messiah*, paralleled by the *Mahdi* in Islam, 176
- Messiah's name**, pre-existence of, 27
- Messianic Age**, in Pharisaism, 37ff.
- Metaphysics**, Jewish approach to, 17
- Metatron*, 33*
- Metayer**, 51
- Metezeau, Jean**, French translation of the Psalms by, 287
- Methuselah**, 40
- Me'ut*, 11
- Middah*, 28*, 44*
- Middoth* = Divine attributes, 24
- Middoth* correspond to '*uṣl al-fikh*', 171
- Midrash**, borrowed from Hellenistic sources, 92f.; expansion of, in Hellenistic circles, 93f.; in Philo, 92f.
- Midrash hag-gadhol**, influenced by Muslim *Hadith*, 159
- Mieses**, 143n.
- Milton**, influence of Kabbalism on, 294
- Min hat-Torah*, 26
- Minbar*, origin of, 163f.
- Minim*, Travers Herford on, 130*; (*Minaei*) in Jerome, 138*
- Miracles**, in *Aboth*, 23; Jews on Christian, 132; Jews protest against mediaeval, 200*; post-biblical, 23; views of the Rabbis on, 19ff.
- Mishnah**, examples of '*Ormah* in, 304ff.
- Missions**, to Jews in Middle Ages, 250f.
- Miswah hab-Ba'ah ba'averaḥ*, 312*
- Mittwoch, E.**, 184f. n.; on Islam and Judaism, 150; on relation between Jewish and Muslim prayer, 162ff., 166; on relation between Islamic and Jewish law, 167
- Mohatra*, 327f.
- Molina**, protests against probabilism, 317
- Moneylending**, adaptation of Talmud to, 218
- Monogamy**, among Jews, 207f.; enforced at Rabbinical synod, 217; influence of Christianity on Jewish, 208; in Pharisaism, 49 f.
- Monotheism**, in Stoicism, 66
- Montaigne**, on the use of Psalms, 287
- Montefiore, C. G.**, 56n.; *Hib. Lec.*, 10*; on hypocrisy, 312*; on Matt. xxv 41, 28*; on the place of the Law in Judaism, 302; on the Pharisaic idea of God, 16†; on torture unknown to Hebrew law, 51*; *see also R.T.*

- Montefiore and Loewe, Rabbinic Anthology**, on esoteric forms of the Tetragrammaton, 83*; *Rabbinic Anthology*, on proselytes, 43*; on *Kawanah*, 319
- Montgomery, James**, on Arabian influence on the Bible, 158‡
- Moore, G. F.**, on macrocosm and microcosm, 76; *see also Jud.*
- Moral problems**, in the Bible, Rabbis' solution of, 17f.
- More, Henry**, *Conjectura Cabalistica* of, 282
- Morinus, John**, on the vowel points, 285
- Mortgages**, English law on, derived from dealings with Jews, 249f.; Jewish influence on, in England, 301*, 324
- Moses**, 40; in the *Kur'an*, 157; Muhammad converses in heaven with, 164
- Moses ben Maimon**, *see Maimonides*
- Moses ben Nachman**, *see Nachmanides*
- Moses of Coucy**, Christians not idolaters, 214; on relations with Gentiles, 215f.
- Moses of Winterthur**, Zwingli accused of being influenced by, 290
- "Mother-Book"**, 27
- Moulton and Milligan**, on δεῖγμα, 75*
- Mu'addin**, corresponds to *Hazzan*, 166
- Muhammad**, 147ff.; took over Biblical stories and legends, 151; converses with Moses, 164; dependence on *Aggadah*, 152f.; Fück's estimate of his originality, 182*; and the Hebrew prophets, 154*; institutes five daily prayers, 164; lack of originality in, 148f.; legislation on marriage and family life, 178; Maimonides' view of, 234
- Mujtahids** parallel to the *Tannāim*, 173
- Mukallids**, parallel to the 'Amorāim, 173
- Munk, Solomon**, on Gabirol, 255*
- Münster, Sebastian**, pupil of Elias Levita, 277*; Hebrew Grammar of, 278
- Mysteries**, relation of Hellenistic Judaism to, 82ff.
- Mystery**, the Decalogue as, 86
- Mystery Religions**, Servetus explains Christian tenets by, 292
- Mysticism** of Ezekiel, 14; in the Kabbalah, 293f.; in Pharisaism, and law, 30
- Mystics**, liberality in Christian, 230ff.; Pharisaic, 12
- Myth and Ritual*, 30
- Nahmanides, Moses**, on "The Virtue of Humility", 228
- Nahum of Gimzo**, teacher of Akiba, 11
- Name of God**, Josephus on, 82f.
- Narbonne**, Hebrew School of, 226
- Nash Papyrus**, 87*
- Nature**, harmony of, and miracles, 20
- Navarrus**, originator of the *trinus contractus*, 327
- Nazareans**, Nazarenes, Augustine on, 138*; Epiphanius on, 120f., 138*; Jerome on, 138*
- Nazirite vow**, fulfilment by 'Or-mah, 307
- Nehemiah**, Jewish and Christian views of, 39
- Nero Kaisar**, in Revelation, 14
- Neshekh**, explained in the Mishnah, 323
- Neubauer, A.**, 110n.; *Catena* on Isa. LIII, 291*; on Jewish protest against miracle at Oxford, 200*; on statue of Persian king in Synagogue, 35†

- 37ff.; mysticism in, 12, 30; particularism in, 39ff.; position of labourer in, 51*; position of women in, 49f.; punishment in, 28f.; respect for human life, 51*; Sabbath in, 175, 307f.; saints in, 35ff.; second coming in, 36f.; slavery in, 50f.; social service in, 45f.; spirit and letter in, 175; and the Synagogue, 43f.; *termini* of, 6f.; tithes in, 47; universalism in, 39ff.; views on polygamy, 50*
- Philebus**, the, 110n.; not read by Alexandrine Jews, 74
- Philip II**, the Dutch and Jews united against, 265
- Philo**, 61ff.; on Aaron's robes, 79f.; Alexandrian influence on the philosophy of, 103f.; allegorical element in his philosophy, 72f.; his allegory, example of, 77f.; and the angels, 77; on astrology, 95ff.; a compiler from other writings, 62f.; divisions of his work, 71; on elementary education, 57n.; on the Essenes, 91; on the Exodus, 84f.; the fall of Adam in, 76f.; on the High Priest, 81ff.; Jewish mythology, defence of, 71*; *κοινώνια* in, 82; use of Logos, 68ff.; the Logos in, 65; material and spiritual, the relation of, in, 76f.; the music of the spheres, 77f.; on mysteries in religion, 84f.; mysteries, sheds light on classical, 82; Orphic ideas in, 77; Palestinian Midrashic elements in, 92f.; on the "pattern", 75; his use of "pattern", xi; Posidonius, dependence on, 64; Rabbinical Judaism, influence on, 74ff.; religion emphasized, 71ff.; religion and philosophy, relation between, 71ff.; the resurrection in, 76f.; on sacrifice, 81; on synagogue worship, 91†; system of, not consistent, 65; Wisdom in, 68ff.
- Philo of Byblos**, on the meaning of Iao, 104
- Phrygia**, syncretism between Judaism and pagan religion in, 88f.
- Phylacteries**, associated with the Exodus, 84†
- Pico della Mirandola**, on Kabbalah, 205, 256; and Kabbalistic mysticism, 293f.; his knowledge of Hebrew, 277*
- Piers Plowman**, liberality of, 230
- Pijper, G. F.**, on Abdallah ibn Salam, 153*
- Pilpulists**, 301
- Pink, H. L.**, on Hebrew-Latin Psalter, 198*
- Pirke Aboth*, see *Aboth*
- Pirke d'R. Eliezer*, influenced by Muslim *Hadith*, 159
- Planets**, influence of, in Paul, 99ff.; influence of, in the Talmud, 101§; in Philo, 96f.; as rebel angels, 97; symbolized by the seven-branched candlestick, 90*
- Plato**, *Laws*, 19; *Republic*, 77*; *Timaeus*, 77*, 96 f.; his use of "pattern", xi
- Platonic theory of Ideas**, 27
- Platonism**, 63
- Poland**, Jews in, 265
- Political theory**, influence of Judaism on Protestant, 271
- Pollard, A. W.**, on the A.V., 201f.
- Polyandry**, Pharisaic views on, 50*
- Polygamy**, among mediaeval Jews, 208; condemned at Rabbinical synod, 217; Pharisaic views on, 50*
- Pomanders**, the, 103
- Pool, David de Sola**, on apostates in the Reformation, 294n.

- Popper, W.**, *see C.H.B.*
- Porphyry**, on robes symbolic of the cosmos, 80
- Portugal**, Jews in, 262
- Posidonius**, main source of Philo's philosophy, 64; on the *Timaeus* incorporated by Philo, 62
- Positive precepts**, 49*
- Posnanski, Ad.**, *catena* on Gen. XLIX 10, 291*
- Postilla Litteralis** of Nicholas de Lyra, 198
- Practice**, Jewish-Christian borrowings in the realm of, 140
- Praeparatio Evangelica**, 79*, 110 n., 111 n., 143 n.
- Prayers**, five daily in Islam, 164 ff.
- Preaching**, 48
- Pre-existence**, of Christ, according to Servetus, 291; in Judaism, 26f.; of the *Kur'an*, 27
- Preisendanz**, on magic, 106§, 107†
- Prideaux**, on Sabbatarianism, 281
- Printing**, Hebrew, in Italy, 263
- Private judgement**, 22*
- Probabiliorism**, 316
- Probabilism**, definition of, 316; development of, 315 ff.; and private judgement, 317 f.
- Promises**, the O.T., Christian use of, 126 ff.
- Prosbul**, 52, 311
προσβολή = *Prosbul*, 311
- Proselytes**, 42*, 102 f.; conditions laid upon, 42†; Melchizedek a type of, 40; the *Yalkut* on, 57 addendum
- Prostration**, origin of, in Muslim worship, 163
- Protestantism and Daniel**, 31
- Prothero, R. E.**, on the Psalms, 286*
- Proverbs**, Wisdom in, 66 f., 76
- Psalms** ("to chant Psalms" = turn Protestant), 286; influence of, on sixteenth-century literature, 285 ff.; Muslims acquainted with, 154*
- Psalter**, post-exilic element in, 10; Latin-Hebrew from Bury St Edmunds, 198*
- Pseudepigraphia**, 31
- Pseudo-Cyprian**, 143 n.
- Pseudo-Gregory of Nyssa**, 144 n.
- Pseudo-Orphic literature**, cosmos as Robe of God, 79*, 80
- Publicans**, 47
- Punishment**, eternal, 28 ff.; future, 27 ff.
- Purgatory**, 30
- Puritanism**, social ethics of, 267 ff.
- Pusey**, on interpretation of Isa. LIII, 291*
- Pythagoras**, and the Sabbath, 78
- Pythagoreanism**, 63 f., 97
- Rab**, on the rule of the planets, 101§
- Raba**, on future redemption, 83†; views on *Kawwanah*, 318*
- Rabinowitz, Rabbi**, 52‡; on the Messiah, 40
- Radin**, on Hadrian's prohibition of circumcision, 119†
- Raleigh, Sir Walter**, on the Psalms, 288
- Ramadhan**, fast of, 160
- Ramsey**, on syncretism in Phrygia, 88
- Ras Shamra texts**, the importance of the number seven in, 97†
- Rashbam (Samuel b. Me'ir)**, acquainted with Latin Bible, 193; commentaries of, 196 f.; on exegesis, 195; knowledge of the Vulgate, 197
- Rashi**, commentaries of, available to Christian scholars, 279; exegesis of, 195 f.; influence on

- Lyra**, 200; influenced by schools of Akiba and Ishmael, 12; in *Correctorium Vaticarum*, 193; *Tosafoth* to his commentaries on the Talmud, 193*; translations of, 196*; at Worms, 203
- Ravashe**, inventor of vowel points, 284
- Ravina**, inventor of vowel points, 284
- Ray'**, 173f.
- Reason**, in the later Stoics, 64ff.
- Reformation, Protestant**, 195; influence of Lyra on, 200; Jews and, 255
- Reinach**, 143n.
- Religio licita*, Judaism a, 117
- Renaissance**, Jews and, 255ff.
- Repentance**, pre-existence of, 27
- Republic* (Plato), 77*
- Resh Lakish**, on the contrast between God's and man's '*Ormah*', 311f.
- Responsa*, 251n.
- Responsa prudentium*, 304
- Resurrection**, 148; in Philo becomes immortality, 76f.
- Retribution**, 148
- Return**, the, *terminus a quo* of Pharisaism, 6f.
- Reuchlin**, deduces the Trinity by Kabbalah, 256; Hebrew Dictionary of, 278; Hebrew teachers of, 277*; and Kabbalistic mysticism, 293f.; on Rashi and Lyra, 200
- "**Revealing the End**", 38*
- Revelation**, Book of, its position compared with that of Daniel, 31*
- Revelations**, "supernatural" in Judaism and Christianity, 20†
- Reward**, future, 27ff.
- Ribbui*, 11
- Righteous Gentiles**, 41
- "**Righteous Priest**", 40
- Ritual slaughter**, 49, 161
- Rivlin, J. J.**, on law in Islam, 183
- Robe**, of God, cosmos as, 79f.
- Roberts, Skeat and Nock**, on Zeus Hypsistos, 89*; on the influence of Judaism on Hellenistic religions, 103*
- Robertson**, 266
- Rogers, Thomas**, on the Judaizing Puritans, 279f.
- Rolle, Richard**, of Hampole, translation of the Psalms by, 286
- Roman Catholic Church**, visions and dogma in, 20†
- Romanus**, martyrdom of, at Antioch, 132
- Romulus**, 94
- Rosenbaum, Rev. R.**, translation of Rashi, 196*
- Roth, Cecil**, on Jewish finance in Middle Ages, 247
- Rouen**, massacre of Jews at, 189*
- R.T.*, appendix on '*Ormah*', 304‡
- Ruku'*, 165
- Rulman Merswin**, 251n.; on good Jews and heathen, 230ff.
- Saadya**, influenced by *Fikh*, 181
- Saadya (Pseudo)**, on Dan. XII 2, 28
- Sabbatai Zebi**, Pepys on, 266*
- Sabbatarian** controversy during the Reformation, 280f.
- Sabbath**, dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees about, 307f.; influence of, on Christians, 140f.; kept by the Patriarchs, 127*; '*Ormah* and fire on the, 306; in Pharisaism, 175; protected in the Roman Empire, 118; Reformation sectaries and, 280; saving of life on the, 307f.
- Sabbath Angels**, 34f.
- Sachau**, on Islam and Judaism, 150
- Sacraments**, reformers' view of, influenced by Judaism, 289f.
- Sacrifice**, 44; Hermetic view of, 81; Philo on, 81f.

- Sadducaeans**, 'Amidah, 24‡; material, in the Canon, 15
- Sadducee**, from Zadok, 24‡; derivation of, 25†
- Sadducees**, Epiphanius on, 120; and Epicurus, 74; and slavery, 51; views on immortality, 25
- Safed School**, mystic and legalistic, 30†
- Sahadah**, 14*
- St-Clair, de Hugo**, author of Dominican Version of the Vulgate, 192 ff.
- Saints**, in Pharisaism, 35 ff.
- Saisset**, on Servetus, 292
- Salam**, corresponds to *birkath hash-shalom*, 166
- Salat**, corresponds to *Tefillah*, 165
- Salat al-Jumu'a**, 163
- Salter, F. R.**, on Puritan views on Poor Relief, 269*
- Salvation** and Torah, 229f., 232f.; in mediaeval Judaism and Christianity, 229ff.
- Salve, George de**, Bishop of Labour, pupil of Elias Levita, 277*; and Elias Levita, 283
- Samaritans**, tests for, in Synagogue, 42†
- Samuel**, 40
- Samuel han-Naghidh**, on *Halakhah*, 185 addendum
- Samuel (R.) b. Nahman**, on the *Minim* and the Decalogue, 86‡
- Sancta Sophia**, 33
- Sanday and Headlam**, 111 n.
- Sarapis**, 82, 83
- Saravia**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Sardinia**, Jews deported to, 116
- Saul**, 40
- Saurat, Denis**, on the influence of Kabbalism on Milton and Spinoza, 294
- S.C.B.M.**, 251 n., 330 n., 331 n.; essay on Jews in English Law in, 57 n.; excursus on usury in, 52†, 322*; excursus on influence of Jews on English law, 301*; on the influence of Rashi, 195*, 203*; on the intervention of a Gentile to obtain usury, 325†; light on distribution of Jews, 209*
- Schacht**, on Islam and Judaism, 150, 183
- Schaff**, on the Reformers and Jewish doctrine, 289
- Schapiro, J.**, on *Haggadah* in the *Kur'an*, 183
- Schechter, S.**, on the force of *Minhag*, 309*; on 'Ormah, 304‡; on parallels to *Bath Kol*, 20†; on prayer, 162; on the school of Safed, 30†
- Schleiermacher**, Servetus a precursor of, 292
- "Schnorrer"**, 245
- Scholasticism**, influence of Jews on, 203 ff.
- Schonfield**, on the *Toledoth Yeshu*, 131†
- Schürer**, on Jewish and Christian use of Orphic literature, 80*
- Sciat Universitas Vesta**, 7
- Scribes**, Epiphanius on, 120
- "Seal of the Prophets"**, Muhammad as, 152
- Se'arah and Se'arah**, 24
- Second Coming**, in II Esdras, 36; in Pharisaism, 36
- Second Tithe**, treatment with 'Ormah, 305f.
- Sedher R. 'Amram**, on *Halakhah*, 185 addendum
- Sefer Behinat Kiyum ham-Miswoth**, on the Pentateuch and the Law, 111 addendum
- Sefer hay-yashar**, influenced by Muslim *Hadith*, 159
- Selden**, Hebrew learning of, 282
- Seleucid**, 51*
- Self-respect**, 45
- Selotha**, 165

- Semag* 1 36d, 213*
- Semukhim*, 15†, 93*
- Sens**, Bible of, 192ff.; Jewish Schools at, 193
- Septuagint**, 11; in *Soferim*, 106
- Sequence** in time and cause, 17
- Sermons**, 46
- Seraph* in Raymond Lully, 205
- Servetus, Michael**, influenced by Marrano Judaism, 257; source of his knowledge of Hebrew, 277*; Christology of, influenced by Jews, 290ff.; political theory of, 271; biblical criticism of, 290 ff.; his theology based on Maimonides, 291
- Seth**, 40
- Seven**, mystic value of, 78
- “**Seven Shepherds**”, 40
- Seventy Nations**, 34†; sacrifices for, at Feast of Tabernacles, 97§
- Shaf Yathib**, in Nehardea, statue of Persian King in Synagogue at, 35†
- Shakespeare**, relics of magic in, 106§; original of Shylock a Gentile, 327; source of the name Jessica, 195†
- Shammai**, 50
- Shammai and Hillel**, difference between schools of, 50; schools of, on *Halakhah*, 185 addendum
- Shammash*=*Hazzan*, 166
- Share** in world to come, 41
- Shari'a*, equivalent of *Halakhah*, 170
- Sheba, Queen of**, in the *Kur'an*, 157f.; in *Targum Sheni* to Esther, 158*
- Shehet Musar*, influenced by Muslim *Hadith*, 159
- Shechinah*, 33
- She'eloth u-Teshuboth*, 304
- Shela (R.)**, pun on Shilo by pupils of, 26*
- Shema'**, the, 34, 165; associated with the Exodus, 84†; the Decalogue with, 86, 87*
- Shemes**, 41*
- Sheshakh=Babel*, 13
- Shi'ite** sect, 176
- Shimsah*, 41*
- Shittuf*, used to make a legal fiction, 310
- Sh'liyah sibbur*, identified with the 'imam, 164
- Shorthand**, Hebrew, in a Cambridge MS., 15
- Shurath had-Din*, 318*
- Shylock**, the original of, a Gentile, 327
- Sidersky, D.**, on the origin of Muslim legends, 183
- Siegfried**, 220n.; on Lyra and Rashi, 198
- Sifre*, on work of scribes, 9
- Siggef*, 51*
- Silver, A. H.**, on the *Mahdi*, 177†
- Simeon b. Gamaliel**, on the manna, 20*
- Simeon b. Isaac b. Abun**, prayer by, 244†
- Simeon (R.)**, on usury, 323
- Simeon (R.) b. El'azar**, on the recitation of the blessing outside Palestine, 29*
- Simeon (R.) b. Menasya**, a member of the 'Edah *Kedoshah*, 8
- Simeon (R.) b. Yohai**, on the coming of the Messianic Age, 37*; mysticism of, 12; on proselytes, 57 addendum
- Simhah shel miṣwah*, 48†; not in Islam, 175
- Simon**, Bishop of the Jacobites, uses “Jew” as a term of abuse, 137f.
- Simpson, D. C.**, on priest and prophet, 30
- Singer, Ch.**, 220n.
- Sins**, remission of, influence on Jews of Christian doctrine, 134f.
- Sixtine Chapel**, 31
- Sixtus IV**, and Kabbalah, 256
- Skeat**, see Roberts

- Slaughter** of animals, in Judaism, 49; in Islam, 161
- Slavery**, in Pharisaism, 50f.
- Smith**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Smith, Adam**, on usury, 321
- Smyth, C. H.**, on the influence of Hebraists at Zurich, 290*
- Social intercourse**, 41f.
- Social service**, in Pharisaism, 45f., 48
- Socrates**, 17; morality of, contrasted with Pharisaic, 19; *Daimon* of, 20†
- Šofrim**, 208
- Solomon**, 107†; story of, in Islam, 159; in the *Kur'an*, 157f.
- Solomon ben Isaac**, *see Rashi*
- Solomon ibn Gabirol** (*Avic-bron*), 203; on humility, 229; identity unknown to Christians, 255*; influence on Christians, 255*; universalism in, 236; *see also S.R.P.*
- Solyman the Magnificent**, Jews in the Empire of, 261f.
- Sombart**, 266; on Talmudic and Protestant ethics, 270†
- Soncino**, Hebrew Bible of, 278
- Soter**, used of God by Philo, 83† *σωτηρία*, of the Exodus in Josephus, 83
- Soury**, on the correction of the Vulgate with the help of Jews, 274; on Hebrew studies among Christians in the Middle Ages, 294n.
- “**Sovereign of the Worlds**”, due to Jewish influence, 156; Goldschmidt on meaning of, 156*
- Spain**, 218; heretics and Jews in, 226; Jews in, banished 1492, 258f.; Judaism illegal in Visigothic, 118
- Spalding**, a translator of the A.V., 278
- Speyer, H.**, on Islam and Judaism, 150, 183
- Spheres**, music of, in Philo, 77f.
- Spiegel, S.**, on the mysticism of Ezekiel, 14‡
- Spinoza**, influence of Kabbalism on, 294; preparation for, by Servetus, 257; a product of the Amsterdam synagogue, 266; Servetus a precursor of, 292
- Spirit and the letter**, in connection with the Sabbath, 175; in fulfilling commandments, 312*
- S.R.P.**, 251n.; on Gabirol, 255*
- Sternhold**, translation of the Psalms, 288*
- Stoicism**, Alexandrine, 63ff.; contact with Judaism, 75
- Stoics**, casuistry in, 300
- Stokes, A. P.**, on early English Hebraists, 274*
- Strabo** (xvi, II, 35), 110n.; on Jewish worship, 91
- Strach**, on *Šemukhim*, 15†
- Strack and Billerbeck**, neglect of *Kawanah* and *Lishmah*, 312
- Strauss**, Servetus a precursor of, 292
- Stubs**, on Judaizing sects 1585, 280*
- Studies in Pharisaism*, 4
- Subordinationism**, in Christian theology, 129f.
- Suetonius**, *Vit. Aug.* 94, 111n.
- Sujud**, 165
- Summa conscientiae* 1534, 315
- Summa de Casibus* 1235, 315
- Sunday**, influence of Sabbath on, 141
- Sunna**, 171; parallel to the Oral Torah in Judaism, 173
- Superstition**, interchange of Jewish and Christian, 206
- Symbolism**, applied to garments of High Priest, 79f.; applied to Tabernacle by Alexandrine Jews, 78ff.

- Symonds, J. A.**, on the censors of the Talmud, 294n.
- Synagogue**, 44; membership of, 42 ff.; in Pharisaism, 43 ff.; services regulated by Justinian, 119
- “**Synagogue, the Great**”, 7f., 45†
- Syncretism**, between Judaism and paganism, 88ff.; in the Essenes, 90f.
- Synods**, Rabbinical, 217
- Tabari**, biblical stories, 159
- Tabe'al-Ramla*, by *Al-Bam*, 57 addendum
- Tabernacle**, symbolism of, in Hellenistic Judaism, 78ff.
- Tacitus**, on the Jews, 116f.; on Teutonic society, 224
- Tafel*, 312*
- Tahanunim*, corresponds to *Du'a*, 165
- Takbir*, traces of the Eighteen Benedictions in, 166
- Talmud**, adaptation of, to European Jewry, 208ff.; on associations with non-Jews, 212ff.; Babylonian, *terminus ad quem* of Pharisaism, 6f.; burning of, in Paris, 204; burnings of, 264f., 301; place of, in Northern French Judaism, 209ff.; quotation of Ecclesiasticus in, 31*
- Talmudists**, Jerome on, 121
- Tam (R.)**, enactment compared with Aethelbert's *Doom*, 207; on the employment of non-Jews, 213; on the force of custom, 211; Talmud not to be taken literally, 214
- Tamé*, double meaning of, 32
- Tamhui*, 45
- Tammuz 4**, mourning prohibited on, 48§
- Tanais**, inscriptions from, 89*
- Tanhum (R.)**, 49*
- Tannāim*, 208; parallel to the *Mujtahids*, 173
- Tarbih*, explained in the Mishnah, 323
- Targum**, 24; mediators in, 33; in *Correctorium Vaticanum*, 193
- Targum Sheni* to Esther, Queen of Sheba in, 158*
- Tatian**, on magic, 106§
- Taurat*, in the *Kur'an*=Torah, 152
- Tauris**, 19
- Tawney**, 266
- Taxes**, 47
- Taxo**, *At-Bash* for *El'azar*, 14
- Taylor, C.** (on *Aboth v. i*), 69†
- Taylor, Jeremy**, and casuistry 300
- Te Deum*, 34
- Tefillah*, *Salat* corresponds to, 165
- Tefillath ha-Hodesh*, 87*
- Temple**, the, 29*; missionary value of, 80f.; pre-existence of, 27; rites of, carried over into synagogue and Christian worship, 44
- Test-benediction**, 25, 42
- Tetragrammaton**, esoteric forms of, 83*
- Teutonic society**, 224
- Thackeray, St John**, on the *Hagiographa*, 31*; on the *Lectio*nary, 9*; on liturgical use of Baruch, 31*
- Θεμιτὸν, use of, by Josephus, 83, 85
- Theodor**, on δεῖγμα, 75*
- Theodosius the Great**, legislation about Jews, 118f.
- Theodosius II**, abolished the Jewish patriarchate, 119
- Theology**, Jewish, 17
- Theophrastus**, 143n.
- Theraputae*, prayers of, 34*
- “**There is no God but God**”, parallel in Targum, 156
- Thesaurus Linguae Sanciae* 1529, 278
- “**Third Generation, the**”, phrase transferred to Christianity, 124*

- Thirteenth century**, importance of, 189
- Thirty Years' War**, and the Jews, 260
- Thomas à Kempis**, *see* Kempis
- Thomas Aquinas**, *see* Aquinas
- Throne of Glory**, pre-existence of, 27
- Timaeus*, the, 64ff., 77*, 96, 97; Hermetic literature, 103; use of, by Alexandrine Stoics, 63
- Tirha de-Sibbura* and its Jesuit parallels, 302f.
- Tishbite, The*, of Elias Levita, xiiff.
- Tithe**, the Second, 305f.
- Tithes**, payment of voluntary, 47
- Toledoth Yeshu*, 131†
- Torah**, concern of the returned exiles with, 8ff.; *Kawanah* required in the fulfilment of, 320; personified in Wisdom, 67; pre-existence of, 27; reasonableness of, Maimonides on, 233f.; salvation and, 232f.; salvation and, in mediaeval Judaism, 229ff.; used for books outside the Pentateuch, 31*; *see also Law*
- "**Torah, Crown of the**", 87*
- Torah sheb-bikethab*, 126†
- Torquemada**, and the Papacy, 262
- Torrey, C. C.**, 185n.
- Torture**, 51*
- Toṣafists**, influence on Ashkenazi Jewry, 209
- Toṣaphoth*, 193; influence of, 218
- Toṣeṭta*, 193*; astrology in, 101
- Toulouse, Council of** (1220), exempts Psalms from ban on reading the Bible, 286
- Tradition**, Muslim, compared with that in *Pirke Aboth*, 170
- Transcendence**, Divine, 23f.
- Travellers**, Jewish, 245
- Tremellius**, influence on A.V., 279
- Triads**, divine, 72
- Trinus contractus*, 327
- Trisagion*, 34†
- Troeltsch**, 266
- Troyes**, Rabbinical synods at, 217
- Trullanum**, *Canon* 11, 144n.
- Turim*, influence of Tosafists on, 218
- Turkish Empire**, Jews in, 260ff.
- Tutorist**, meaning of, 316
- Tyndale**, his knowledge of Hebrew, 201†, 220 addendum; behind the A.V., 201f.; influenced by Luther, 202
- Tyrrhonius Cladus (G.)**, synagogue ruler and husband of high priestess, 88
- '*Ulamā*, corresponds to *Hakhamim*, 170f.; the heirs of the prophets, 180
- United Provinces**, Jews in, 265
- Universalism**, 148; in Jonah, 10; in Maimonides, 235; in Pharisaism, 39ff.
- University Bible**, 192
- '*Uṣūl al-fikh*, correspond to *middoth*, 171
- Usury**, allowed to Jews by mediaeval Church, 326; attitude of the Church to, 325ff.; Jesuit casuistry and, 327; among Jews in the Middle Ages, 324f.; in Jewish and Christian ethics, 248ff.; in the Mishnah, 323f.; in the Pentateuch, 321f.; prohibited in Islam and Judaism, 180; resemblance between Jewish and Jesuit casuistry of, 321f.; in the Talmud, 322f.
- Valentinus**, philosophy of, 104
- "**Vanity**", meaning of, in Rom. VIII 18, 98ff.
- van Ronkel**, on Muslim stories about Jews and Christians, 153*
- Variants** in Bible text, 9*
- Vecinho**, 262

- Venice**, books snatched from fire by Christians, 265; Elias Levita at, 283; Jews in, 263
- Verschorists**, their requirement of Hebrew for full membership, 274
- Vespasian**, 107
- Virgil**, his Messianic Eclogue, 116
- Visions**, and dogma in the Roman church, 20†
- Visiting sick**, 48
- Vitelleschi**, protests against Probabilism, 317
- Vocabulary**, Hebrew, 32
- Vowel points**, discussion as to their originality, 282 ff.; work of Elias Levita on, 284f.
- Vulgata**, 193, 194; attempts to correct text of, 192, 274; Dominican Version of, 192
- Waite, A. E.**, on the Kabbalah, 256*
- Waldis, Burkhard**, of Hesse, and the Psalter, 286
- Walid ibn Uḳba**, and Jewish witchcraft, 179
- Walton**, Hebrew learning of, 282
- Washington, George**, accused of professing himself a Jew 1682, 280
- Weber**, 266, 294n.; on Luther's idea of "Calling", 268ff.; on Talmudic and Protestant ethics, 270
- Weiss, J. H.**, on *Halakhah le-Mosheh mi-Sinai*, 169†
- Wensinck**, on Islam and Judaism, 150
- Wesley**, 48
- Westcott**, on the A.V., 201
- Wethkin**, the, and the Exodus, 84†; and the *Shema'*, 34*
- Whitaker**, quotes Cardinal Cajetan on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 291*
- White, Bishop of Ely**, on Sabatianism, 281
- Whitehall, James**, prosecuted for preaching Judaism 1624, 280
- William of Auvergne, Bishop of Paris**, introduces Maimonides to Christian thought, 204
- William of Mara**, 198f
- William of Ockham**, on the inerrancy of Scripture, 240f.
- Williams, Lukyn, A.**, 144n.; on test-benediction, 25†, 42†
- Wine**, prohibition of non-Jewish, 212f.; use of non-Jewish in England, 215; use of non-Jewish in Moslem countries, 213*; use of non-Jewish in Northern France, 212f.
- Wisdom, Book of**, 61; Wisdom in, 68
- Wisdom**, in *Bereshith Rabba*, 75; personification of, 33; in Philo, replaced by Logos, 68ff.; in Proverbs, 76; in Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, 66f.
- Wisdom literature**, moral rather than intellectual, 17
- "**Wise, the**", and the '*Am ha-'areṣ*', 46*
- Witchcraft**, in Islam and Judaism, 178f.
- Women**, position of, in Pharisaism, 49f.
- Worcester, Council of**, enactments against Jewish magic, 200
- "**World to come**", 37*, 41
- Worms**, Rashi at, 203
- Wright, Dudley**, on the burnings of the Talmud, 264, 301*
- Wutz**, on Iao, 104†
- Yannai (R.)**, a pun on *Tinnom* by pupils of, 26*; on charity, 242‡
- Yehi'el (R.) of Paris**, on Jews being forced to teach Hebrew to Christians, 193; disputes with Christians, 214

- Yehudah**, *see Judah*
- Yemoth ham-Mashiah**, 37*
- Yiddish**, books in, 245†
- Yinnon**, pre-existent name of the Messiah, 26
- "Yohanan ben Zakkai, Letter of"**, 131*
- Yohanan (R.)**, on the annulment of a decree by failure to adopt it, 302*; on the atoning value of the sacrifice of Isaac, 135; on eternal punishment, 29*; on provision for miracles at the Creation, 20*; on the rule of the planets, 101§; universalism of, 41*
- Yom Kippur**, Arabian Jews use 'Ashura for, 165
- Yoše (R.)**, and his wife, 49*
- Yoše (R.) b. Meshullam**, included in the 'Edah Kedhosha, 8
- Yoser**, 34* and †
- Yudan (R.) b. Aibo**, use of *gematria* by, 13*
- Zabur**, in the *Kur'an*=Psalter, 152
- Zacuto**, 262
- Zadok and Sadducee**, 24‡
- Zakat** in Islam, 179
- Zamahshari**, biblical stories, 159
- Zechariah**, called *Kabbalah*, 31†; in A.V., 12
- Zedekiah**, 40
- Zeitlin, Sol.**, on the holiday on Tammuz 4, 48§
- Zekhuth 'Abot**, 36
- Zekhuth Banim**, 36
- Zephaniah**, 40
- Zeus Hypsistos**, 89*
- Zohar**, relation to Gnosticism of the, 106†; influence of, on the Renaissance, 292ff.
- Zoroastrianism**, influence of, on Pharisaism, 25; influence on Islam, 149
- Zosimus**, Hermetic fragment in, 111n.
- Zurich**, influence of Hebraists on the Church of, 290*; theological seminary at, founded by Zwingli, 276
- Zwingli**, Christology of, 290; his doctrine of the Holy Communion influenced by Jewish interests, 289f.; on Hebrew scholarship, 275f.; his Hebrew studies, 276f.; and the old exegesis, 288ff.; theology of, influenced by Judaism, 288ff.
- Zwinglians**, use of the Psalms, 286

B. LIST OF PASSAGES CITED

A. THE BIBLE: OLD TESTAMENT

- Gen. 1, 105; 1, 15, 95; 1, 21, 9†; 1, 26, 144n.; III, 24, 96; VI, 9, 36*; XII, 6, 241; XIII, 7, 241; XIV, 19, 40; XV, 5, 101§; XVII, 13, 57 addendum; XVIII, 8, 309*; XXII, 1-14, 18; XXII, 14, 135*; XXIII, 4, 57 addendum; XXXI, 20, 318*; XXXI, 26, 318*; XXXVIII, 1, 195; XLVI, 23, 9†; XLIX, 4, 15; XLIX, 6, 36*; XLIX, 10, 291*
- Exod. V, 14, 268*; XII, 16, 310; XII, 44, 85; XIII, 17-XV, 26, 84*; XIV, 27, 20*; XV, 22, 69§; XVIII, 20, 318*; XXI, 14, 312*; XXII, 25, 322 and 322*; XXIV, 10, 16†; XXV, 9, 76*; XXVIII, 38, 57 addendum; XXXII, 25, 41*; XXXIII, 11, 239; XXXIV, 28, 309*
- Lev. X, 1-7, 93*; XIX, 26, 178†; XIX, 32, 312*; XXV, 14, 318*; XXV, 17, 312*; XXV, 35-6, 307*; XXV, 35-7, 322; XXVII, 26, 306
- Num. X, 2, 144n.; XII, 3, 228; XVI, 1, 36*; XVI, 46, 110n.; XXIII, 19, 144n.; XXVI, 11, 36*; XXVII, 15, 16, 57n.
- Deut. IV, 19, 98; VIII, 14, 228; X, 19, 57 addendum; XV, 311; XVIII, 10, 178†; XXIII, 19, 20, 322; XXXII, 8ff., 98; XXXIII, 39, 16†
- Joshua IX, 4, 312*; XVI, 10, 241
- Judges I, 27-33, 241; V, 31, 57 addendum
- I Sam. II, 6, 36*
- II Sam. XXII, 84*; XXII, 32, 156; XXIV, 6, 9†; XXIV, 7, 241
- I Kings IX, 16, 241
- II Kings XIII, 21, 144n.
- I Chron. VI, 22-3, 36*; XXIX, 15, 57 addendum
- II Chron. XIII, 22, 56n.; XXIV, 27, 56n.

- Neh. VIII, 8; IX, 6, 39; IX, 16-17, 39
- Job IV, 12, 41*; IX, 9, 275*; IX, 26, 244
- Ps. XV, 5, 322 and 322*; XXV, 10, 44*; XXXVIII, 13, 135*; XXXIX, 13, 57 addendum; XLI, 1, 242; XLV, 7, 312*; XLIX, 8, 155; LI, 17, 81*; LXXII, 17, 26; LXXIV, 8, 43; LXXV, 6, 228; LXXVII, 6, 156*; LXXXIX, 15, 44*; CX, 4, 40; CXIX, 301; CXCI, 4, 57 addendum; CXXXII, 16, 41*; CXLVI, 9, 57 addendum
- Prov. I, 4, 312*; III, 18, 239; VIII, 5, 312*; VIII, 12, 312*; VIII, 21, 57 addendum; VIII, 22, 27, 33; XI, 27, 242*; XXVIII, 8, 322*; XXX, 8, 268*; XXXI, 24, 322*
- Eccles. IX, 4, 29*
- Cant. I, 3, 43*
- Isa. I, 11-15, 44*; VII, 6, 57 addendum; X, 32-XII, 6, 84*; XIII, 10, 275*; XVIII, 1, 131*; XVIII, 2, 131*; XXVI, 4, 156*; XXIX, 17, 143n.; XXX, 7, 111 addendum; XLI, 2, 101§; XLI, 4, 16†; XLII, 21, 57 addendum; XLIV, 5, 57 addendum; XLIV, 6, 144n.; XLV, 7, 34; XLV, 20, 111 addendum; XLVIII, 20-2, 144n.; XLIX, I, 144n.; LI, 9, 156*; LII, 13, 236; LIII, 257, 291; LV, 1, 69†; LVI, 6, 57 addendum; LVI, 7, 57 addendum; LVII, 15, 237; LVIII, 10, 244; LXI, 6, 57 addendum
- Jer. II, 5, 100†; X, 2, 101 and 101§; XVII, 7, 242*; XVII, 22, 310; XXV, 26, 13; LI, 1, 13; LI, 39, 29*; LI, 41, 13
- Ezek. I, 105; III, 12, 34†; III, 17, 157*; XX, 25, 143n.; XXXIII, 2, 6, 7, 157*; XXXVII, 1-10, 157*; XLIV, 1ff., 144n.

Dan. II, 34, 144n.; VII, 9, 16†; XII, 2, 28 and 28*

Mic. V, I (English 2), 13*; V, 5 (English 4), 40

Amos V, 8, 275*

Jonah IV, 9, 220 addendum

Zeph. III, 9, 29*

Zech. II, 3 (English I, 20), 40; XIV, 21, 322*

NEW TESTAMENT

Matt. II, 13*; XIII, 11, 307; XVIII, 8, 28*; XXIII, 15, 57n.; XXV, 41, 28*

Mark II, 27, 175; XIII, 25, 100*

Luke VI, 35, 52, 248, 321, 326

John III, 2, 153*; III, 10, 153*; VII, 50–2, 153*; X, 34, 31*; XIV, 26, 13*; XVI, 7, 13*

Acts VII, 38, 86*

Rom. VIII, 20, 98

I Cor. II, 8, 99; XV, 25, 38

Col. II, 16 sqq., 110n.

Gal. III, 8, 127*

Heb. VII, 2, 3, 40

Jude 13, 97†

Rev. XIII, 18, 14; XVI, 2, 14

B. APOCRYPHA

II Esdras (IV Esdras), VII, 88 ff., 98*; II Esdras VII, 102–15, 155

Judith IX, 2, 92†

Wisdom VII, 17, 68; IX, 8, 27, 76*; XVI, 28, 34*; XVIII, 24, 78

Ecclus. XI, 20, 21, 268; LI, 9 (Heb. text), 24†

I Macc. X, 48§

II Macc. I, 18 ff., 23; X, 27–8, 34*

C. PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Jubilees VI, 18–19, 127*; VI, 21, 48†; XV, 1, 127*; XV, 31, 111n.; XVI, 20 ff., 127*; XVIII, 18, 127*;

XXII, 1, 127*; XXIII, 25, 155; XXX, 4 ff., 92†; XXXII, 4, 127*; XXXIII, 27, 127*; XLIV, 4, 127*

I Enoch XXI, 4, 97†

Test. Benj. VIII, ch. III, 111n.

Test. Levi, 6, 7, 92†

D. PHILO

Philo, *De Cher.* 7, 111n.; 13, 14, 72*; *De Conf. Ling.* 2, 110n.; 2 ff., 71*; *De Cong. Er. Gr.* 23, 111n.; *De Gigant.* 2, 110n.; 13, 71*, 107†; *De Leg. Alleg.* III, 31, 69*; *De Migr. Abr.* I, 69*; 16, 110n.; 32, 96*; 39, 92†; *De Mon.* I, 1, 97*; I, 7, 110n.; II, 12, 110n.; *De Mund. Op.* 7, 97*; 33, 111n.; 39, 111n.; 43, 110n.; *De Plant.* 25, 81*; *De Posterit. Cain.* 40, 111n.; *De Prof.* II, 111n.; 18, 73*; 20, 72*; *De Somn.* I, 6, 78*; *De Spec. Leg.* III, 82*; *De Vict. Off.* 12, 85*; *De Vita Cont. M.* 475, 34*; *De Vit. Moys.* I, 50, 77*; III, 11, 82†; III, 12 ff., 79*; III, 27, 91†; *Leg. ad. C. XVI,* 31, 57n.; *Quaest. in Gen. fr.* 110n.; *Quis Rer. Div. Her. Sit.* 45, 90*; 57, 110n.; 60, 96†; *Quod Det. Pot. Ins.* 2 ff., 111n.; 31, 110n.

E. JOSEPHUS

Jos. *Antt.* II, ch. IX, 2, 111n.; III, ch. V, 4, 110n.; III, ch. VII, 7, 79*; IV, ch. VIII, 12, 57n.; IV, ch. VIII, 48, 94†; VIII, ch. II, 5, 107*; XIII, ch. X, 5, § 288, 46*; XIII, ch. X, 6, § 298, 46*; XX, ch. V, 2, 110n.; *Ap.* I, 12, 57n.; II, 17 sqq., 57n.; *B.J.* II, ch. VIII, 5, 90*; II, ch. VIII, 5, § 128, 34*; VII, ch. X, 2, 80†; *Vita*, 2, 111n.; 37, § 188, 243*

F. RABBINIC LITERATURE

(1) Mishnah (arranged according to alphabetical order of titles of tractates)

‘*Abhodah Zarah* I, § 3, 56n.; I, § 6, 309*

- Abot* II, § 5, 185n.; II, § 15, 46*; v, § 1, 7*; 69†; v, § 8, 56n.; v, § 9, 56n.; vi, § 2, 15
- Baba Meṣia'* IV, § 12, 312*; v, § 1, 331n.; v, § 10, 331n.
- Berakoth*, I, § 5, 84†; II, § 1, 331n.; III, § 1, 331n.
- 'Erubin VII, §§ 6ff., 330n.
- Gittin IX, § 10, 57n.
- Hagigah II, § 1, 105†
- Hullin I, § 1, 57n.; IV, § 7, 106†
- Ma'aser Sheni IV, § 4, 330n.; IV, § 5, 330n.
- Megillah IV, § 10, 56n., 105†, 238*
- Nazir II, § 5, 307, 330n.
- Pe'ah I, § 1, 179; IV, 251n.; VIII, § 7, 57n.; VIII, § 9, 242*
- Pesalim X, §§ 4-5, 110n.
- Sabbath I, §§ 1ff., 330n.; VI, § 10, 106†; XVI, § 3, 306, 330n.
- Sanhedrin VIII, § 7, 307*; X, § 1, 25, 31*
- Shebi'iith X, § 4, 330n.
- Temurah V, § 1, 306, 330n.
- Terummoth III, § 9, 80†
- Tadayim IV, § 6, 31*, 104§; IV, § 7, 51*, 90*
- Toma I, § 1, 49*; I, §§ 2, 3, 81†
- (2) *Tosefta* (arranged according to alphabetical order of titles of tractates)
- 'Abhodhah Zarah I, § 3, 57n.; III, § 1, 220n.; III, § 14, 57n.; VII, 57n.
- Baba Kamma VII, § 3, 57n.; X, § 15, 318*
- Hagigah III, § 35, 90*
- Megillah IV, § 31, 238*
- Pe'ah I, § 1, 185 addendum
- Sanhedrin XIII, § 2, 56n.
- Shekalim II, § 16, 57n.
- Sukkah II, § 6, 111n.
- (3) Babylonian Talmud
- 'Abhodhah Zarah 3b, 33*; 36a, 330n.; 65a, 43*
- Baba Bathra 12a, 180; 14b, 31*; 21a, 57n.; 60b, 47*, 302*, 330n.
- Baba Kamma 17a, 69†; 38a, 56n.; 79b, 330n.; 82a, 7*, 9*; 83b, 48§; 84a, 48§; 113b, 43*
- Baba Meṣia' 58b, 312*, 318*; 59a, 49* (twice), 318*; 59b, 22*; 62b, 325; 71a, 322*; 83a, 31*; 85a, 46*, 57n.; 85b, 57n.; 110a, 220n.
- Bekhoroth 50b, 81†
- Berakoth 9b, 34*; 10a, 110n.; 11b, 86†; 12a, 86†; 13a, 318*; 24a, 7*; 32a, 307*; 33b, 45†; 34b, 37*; 40a, 57n.; 52a, 22*; 57b, 29*
- 'Erubin 7a, 22*; 13b, 22*
- Gittin 52a, 49*; 61a, 56n.
- Hagigah 5a, 242†; 16a, 155
- Horayoth 3b, 330n.
- Hullin 13b, 56n.; 94a, 309*, 312*, 318*; 134b, 55n.
- Kerithoth 6b, 46*
- Kethuboth 5a, 307*; 15b, 307*; 19a, 307*; 67b, 49*, 57n.; 68a, 49*; 108b, 244†
- Kiddushin 30a, 57n.; 32b, 312*; 40b, 56n.
- Makkoth 7a, 178; 24a, 322*, 331n.
- Megillah 3a, 31*, 38*; 13a, 56n.; 20a, 318*; 22b, 302*; 25a, 45†
- Nedarim 41a, 56n.; 81a, 57n.
- Niddah 31a, 56n.
- Pesalim 49b, 46*; 54a, 26; 57a, 81†; 64b, 56n.; 87b, 57n.; 117b, 83‡
- Rosh hash-Shanah 7a, 31*; 17a, 28*; 24b, 35†; 28b, 318*
- Sabbath 31a, 180*; 32a, 57n.; 33b, 36*; 63a, 57n.; 105a, 15†; 113b, 37*; 116b, 180†; 118b, 37*; 119b, 41*, 57n.; 156a, 101§
- Sanhedrin 12a, 14†; 22a, 13*; 22b, 49*; 65b, 178†; 67b, 179 and

- I** 79*; 76b, 49*; 90a, 96†; 91b, 25†, 37*; 96a, 46*; 97a, 37*; 97b, 177†; 98b, 26*, 37* (twice), 75*; 99a, 37*; 99b, 46*; 101a, 129†; 104b, 7*; 109b, 36*
Shebu'oth 39a, 312*
Sotah 5a, 56n.; 17a, 49*; 47b, 244†
Sukkah 52b, 14*, 40
Ta'anith 11a, 48*; 19a, 56n.; 22b, 51*; 24b, 49*; 25a, 49*
Yebamoth (*Yabmuth*) 11b, 129†; 46a, 43*; 62b, 49*
Toma 20b, 78*; 85a, 307*; 87a, 321*
(4) Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud (arranged according to alphabetical order of titles of tractates)
Berakhoth 3c, 86†, 87*; 4a, 37*; 5a, 13*; 11c, 45†
Bikkurim 64a, 43*
Demai 26b, 51*
Hagigah 79d, 90*
Kiddushin 61c, 49*
Ma'aser Sheni 53d, 8*; 56b, 309*
Pe'ah 20c, 309*
Sabbath 3c, 229*; 3d, 302*; 8d, 99*
Sanhedrin 25d, 178†
Ta'anith 65b, 144n.; 68d, 38*
Yebamoth 8d, 43*; 12c, 220n.
Toma 44b, 79*
(5) *Targumim*; *Aboth de R. Nathan*; *Soferim*; *Megillath Ta'anith*
Targum Onkelos to Gen. xxxviii, 2, 92†
Targum Jerusalem to Lev. xix, 26, 178†; Deut. xviii, 10, 178†
Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Num. xxi, 3, 92†
Targum to Cant. iv, 1, 46*; iv, 3, 79*; iv, 15, 69†; v, 10, 79*
Aboth de R. Nathan, vers. I, ch. xvi, f. 32b, 46*; ch. xxxvi, f. 54a, 36*
Aboth de R. Nathan, vers. II, ch. xxvi, f. 27a, 180*
Soferim 1, 8, 106*; XIV, 18, 220n.
Megillath Ta'anith IV, 48§
(6) *Mekhilta*; *Sifra*; *Sifre Mekhilta*, Pišha i (1, 5), 36*;
Shiratha i (π, 5), 57n.; **Shiratha** iv (π, 31; H. p. 130), 16†; **Shiratha** vii (π, 54), 31*; 'Amalek iv (π, 182), 318*; **Shabbatha** i (π, 109b), 175
Sifra, 'Ahare Moth, f. 86b, 56n.; Kedhoshim, f. 88d, 312*; 'Emor, f. 104d, 48§; Behar, f. 107c, 318*; Behar, f. 107d, 318*; Behar, f. 109c, 307*
Sifre Num., Beha'lothekha, § LXXXIX, f. 25a, 318*; Balak, § CXXXI, end, f. 48b, 81†
Sifre Deut., va'-eth-hannan, § XXXIV, f. 74a, 86§, 87*; va'-eth-hannan, §§ XXXIV-V, f. 74a, 86§; va'-eth-hannan, § XXXV, f. 74b, 87*; 'Ekebh, § XLVII, f. 83b, 20*; 'Ekebh, § XLVIII, f. 84b, 9*; 'Ekebh, § XLIX, f. 85a, 7*; Re'eh, § LXXXIV, f. 92a, 96†; Re'eh, § CXVI, f. 98b, 57n.
(7) *Tanhuma*; *Tanhuma Buber*; *Pesi'ka Kahana*; *Pesi'ka Rabbathi*
Tanhuma, Noah, f. 15a, 36*; f. 17a, 318*; vay-Yera, f. 31b, 44*; f. 33a, 126†; f. 34a, 38*; f. 36a, 309*; f. 36b, 318*; f. 40a, 135*; vayehi, f. 76a, 15†; Shemot, f. 81b, 55n.; f. 88b, 16†; vay-Yakhal, f. 168b, 79*; f. 170a, 69†
Tanhuma Buber, va'-era', f. 13a, 15†; Re'eh, f. 10a, 31*

Pesiqta Kahana, f. 49ab, 36*; f. 158a, 162; f. 172b, 93*; f. 177a, 81†; f. 185a, 46*
Pesiqta Rabbathi, f. 9a, 31*; f. 42b, 243*; f. 116a, 312

(8) Midrash Rabbah: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers; Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther; *Mattenoth Kehunnah*

Bereshith (Genesis) *Rabbah*

Genesis Rabbah, ad init., 110n.; I, § 14, 56n.; III, § 4, 79*; IV, § 4, 56n.; V, § 5, 20*; VI, § 7, 78*; VII, § 2, 31*; VIII, § 3, 68*; VIII, § 9, 130*; IX, § 5, 9†; XLIV, § 12, 101*; XLVI, § 2, 57 addendum; LVI, § 10, 135*; LXIII, § 8, 136*; XCIV, § 9, 9†; XCVI, § 5, 94*

Shemoth (Exodus) *Rabbah*

Exodus Rabbah III, § 6, 16†; XXVIII, § 5, 16†; XXIX, § 3, 86†; XXIX, § 5, 144n.; L, § 1, 79*

*Way-Tikra*³ (Leviticus) *Rabbah*

Leviticus Rabbah IV, § 5, 50*; X, § 1, 312*; X, § 6, 79*; XXVII, § 6, 302*; XXIX, § 9, 135*; XXX, § 12, 46*; XXXI, § 7, 79*

Bemidbar (Numbers) *Rabbah*

Numbers Rabbah III, § 1, 46*; XV, § 4, 76*; XVIII, § 5, 36*; XVIII, § 13 (some texts XI), 36*; XIX, § 3, 31*, 39*; XXI, § 2, 57n.; XXI, § 3 (some texts XXI, 4), 92†; XXI, § 8, 12†; XXI, § 20, 57n.

Canticles Rabbah III, § 4, 13*

Ruth Rabbah III, § 2, 29*

Ecclesiastes Rabbah IX, § 9, 56n.

Esther Rabbah II, § 3, 49*

Mattenoth Kehunnah on Gen.R. XLVI, § 2, 57 addendum

(9) Midrash Psalms: Midrash Samuel; *Pirke de R. Eliezer*; *Tanna de Be Eliyyahu*; *Lekah Tobh*; *'Ekhah Zuta*; *Yalkut*

Midrash Psalms XII, § 4, f. 54b, 304*; XIX, 1, f. 82a, 45†; XXXVII, f. 126b, 40; XLV, § 4, f. 135b, 36*; XCIII, f. 207b, 26*; CIV, § 4, f. 220b, 79*; CXXXVII, § 3, f. 262b *ad fin.*, 302*; CXXXVII, § 3, f. 263a, 302*

Midrash Samuel 48b, 9†

Pirke de R. Eliezer XXXII, 26*

Tanna de Be Eliyyahu, p. 34, 34†; p. 43, 50*; p. 135, 31*; p. 197, 229†

T. de B.E. Zuta, ch. XX, end, 41*

Lekah Tobh 93b, 43*

'Ekhah Zuta, §§ 41, 42, f. 35b, 57n.

Yalkut, Exod. XVI, 4, § 258, 20*

Isa. XXVI, 2, § 429, 41*; on Isa. XLIV, 5, § 459, 57 addendum

(10) Prayer Books: Abrahams; Davis-Adler; Gaster; Pool; Singer

P.B.A. pp. XLIII ff., 56n.; p. XLVII, 56n.; p. LX, 56n.; p. LXIV, 42†; p. LXXXVI, 111 addendum; p. CXCI, 135*; p. CCV, 56n.

P.B.D.A. p. 190, 244†; pp. 173, 220, 248, 84*

P.B.G. p. 6, 185 addendum; p. 58, 111 addendum; II, 24, 330n.

P.B.P. p. 6, 185 addenda; p. 90, 111 addendum

P.B.S. p. 5, 45*, 185 addendum; pp. 14-15, 318*; p. 15, 84†; p. 34, 57n.; pp. 37ff., 56n.; p. 39, 34†; p. 44, 84†; p. 45, 42†; p. 75, 111 addendum; p. 175, 127*; p. 200, 56n.; p. 205, 15*; p. 218, 318*; p. 252, 135*; p. 274, 56n.; p. 275, 23

- (ii) Remaining Rabbinic literature: *Tosafoth* to Rashi on T.B.; *Yere'im*; *Semagh*; *Sefer hay-Yashar*; 'Akedhath *Yishak*
- Tosafoth* to 'Abhodhah *Zarah* 55*b*, 213; to *Pesahim* 51*a*, 220n.; to *Sukkah*, f. 3*a*, 185 addendum
- Yere'im*, para. 102, 220n.; para. 270, 220n.
- Semagh* I, f. 10*a*, para. 45, 5, 220n.; I, f. 10*a*, para. 48, 220n.
- Sefer hay-Yashar* 43*a*, para. 441, 220n.; para. 45, 5, 220n.
- 'Akedhath *Yishak*, I, f. 7*a*, 78*

G. KUR'AN

Kur'an II, 244, 157*; VII, 44, 156; LXI, 6, 13*; LXXXIII, 17, 155; LXXXIV, 48, 155; LXXX, 33ff., 155

Kansas City
Public Library



Presented to the Library by
Religious Exhibit
A. L. Morris
Raymond P. Morris

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



130 988

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY